

3874

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

VOL. XXXVIII.

INT. 1855

PUBLISHED IN

MARCH AND JUNE, 1855.



**LONDON:
THOMAS RICHARDSON AND SON,**

172, FLEET STREET; 9, CAPEL STREET, DUBLIN; AND DERBY.
MARSH & BEATTIE, EDINBURGH; HUGH MARGEY, GLASGOW.
NEW YORK: EDWARD DUNIGAN AND BROTHER, 151, FULTON STREET.
PARIS: 9, RUE DU COQ, NEAR THE LOUVRE, STASSIN AND XAVIER.

—
1855.

92726

CONTENTS OF No. LXXV.



ART.	PAGE
I.—1. Gosselin's Power of the Popes in the Middle Ages. London : Dolman, 1854.	
2. Roscoe's Lives of Lorenzo de Medici and Leo X. London : Bohn, 1853.	
3. Life of Savonarola. By DR. MADDEN. London : Newby, 1853.	
4. Ranke's History of the Popes. London : Bohn, 1853.	
5. Machiavelli's History of Florence. London : Bohn, 1851. 	2
II.—Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses connected with the Royal Succession of Great Britain. By AGNES STRICKLAND, Author of "Lives of Queens of England." Edinburgh and London : Blackwood and Son, 1854. 	73
III.—1. Fresenius' Instructions in Chemical Analyses. London : Churchill.	
2. Galloway's Manual of Qualitative Analyses. London : Churchill.	
3. Abel and Bloxam's Handbook of Chemistry. London : Churchill.	
4. Faraday's Lectures. London : Longmans. ...	98
IV.—1. The Natural History of Creation. By T. LINDLEY KEMP. London : Longmans, 1852.	
2. Indications of Instinct. By T. LINDLEY KEMP ; being Nos. 24 and 54 of the "Traveller's Library." London : Longmans, 1854. 	113
V.—The Druses of the Lebanon. Their Manners, Customs, and History. With a translation of their Religious Code. By GEORGE WASHINGTON CHASSAUD, late of Beyrout, Syria. London : Bentley, 1855. 	120

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
VI.—1. The Chinese Empire ; forming a Sequel to the Work entitled, "Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet." By M. HUC, formerly Missionary Apostolic in China. 2 vols. 8vo. London : Longmans, 1855.	
2. History of the Insurrection in China ; with Notices of the Christianity, Creed, and Proclamations of the Insurgents. By MM. CALLERY and IVAN. 8vo. London : Smith, Elder, and Co., 1853.	
3. Discoveries in Chinese ; or the Symbolism of the Primitive Characters of the Chinese System of Writing. By STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS. 8vo. New York : Norton, 1854.	134
VII.—Descartes on Method. Edinburgh : Sutherland and Knox ; London : Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1852.	169
VIII.—A Bill to Promote Education in England, (prepared and brought in by LORD JOHN RUSSELL and MR. HASTINGS.) Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 8 February, 1855.	212
IX.—1. The History of the Early Puritans ; from the Reformation to the Opening of the Civil War, in 1642. By J. B. MARSDEN, M.A. Second Edition. London : Hamilton, Adams, and Co., 1853.	
2. The History of Later Puritans ; from the Opening of the Civil War, in 1642, to the Ejection of the non-conforming Clergy in 1662. By J. B. MARSDEN, M.A. Second Edition. London : Hamilton, Adams and Co, 1854.	
3. Origin and Development of Anglicanism ; or a History of the Litanies, Homilies, Articles, Bibles, Principles, and Governmental System of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. WATERWORTH, S.J. London : Burns and Lambert, 1854.	
4. A History of the Articles of Religion. By CHARLES HARDWICKE, M.A. 8vo. Cambridge : Deighton, 1851.	
5. A History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices. By Rev. FRANCIS PROCTER, M.A. 8vo. Cambridge : McMillan and Co., 1855.	232

CONTENTS OF No. LXXVI.

ART.	PAGE
I.—History of the United States of America, from the Discovery of the American Continent. By George Bancroft. London : Routledge and Co., 1851.	273
II.—Poems. By Aubrey de Vere. Post 8vo. London : Burns and Lambert, 1855.	300
III.—1. Memoirs of the Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil. By W. Torrens McCullagh, Author of "The Industrial History of free Nations," &c., &c. 2 vols. London : Colburn, 1855.	
2. Sketches Legal and Political. By the late Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil, edited, with Notes, by M. W. Savage, Esq. 2 vols. London : Colburn, 1855.	
3. Sketches of the Irish Bar ; with other Literary and Political Essays. By William Henry Curran, Esq., 2 vols. 8vo. London, Colburn, 1855,	321
IV.—1. Lingard's History of England ; St. Thomas of Can- terbury. Vols. 1—3. Sixth Edition. London : Dolman, 1855.	
2. Roger of Wendover's Chronicles. London : Bohn. 1853,	355
V.—The Life, Times, and Contemporaries of Lord Clon- curry. By William John Fitzpatrick. Member of the Royal Dublin Society. Dublin : James Duffy, 1855,	413

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
VI.—1. Mahometanism in its Relation to Prophecy, or an Inquiry into the Prophecies concerning Antichrist, with some reference to their bearing on the events of the present day. By Ambrose Lisle Philipps, Esq., of Grace Dieu Manor, Leicestershire. London : Dolman, 1855.	
2. Apocalyptic Sketches. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming. London : Hall and Virtue, 1854.	
3. The Apocalypse Fulfilled, or an Answer to Apocalyptic Sketches. By Dr. Cumming. By the Rev. P. S. Desprez, B. D., &c. London : Longman, Brown, Green, and Longman's, 1854.	
4. An Argument for the Neronic date of the Apocalypse, from Internal Evidence. By the Rev. P. S. Desprez. London : Walton and Mitchel, 1855.	
5. Lectures on the History of the Turks. By the author of "Loss and Gain." Dublin : Duffy, 1854,	... 424
VII.—Sisters of Charity Catholic and Protestant, Abroad and at Home. By Mrs. Jameson. London : Longman, 1855,	... 442
VIII.—1. Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Management and Government of the College of Maynooth. Part I. Report and Appendix. Dublin, 1855.	
2. Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Management and Government of the College of Maynooth. Part II. Minutes of Evidence. Dublin, 1855,	... 461
IX.—The Blessed Sacrament, or the Works and Ways of God. By Frederick William Faber, D. D., Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London, Dublin, and Derby : Richardson and Son, 1855,	... 507

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

MARCH, 1855.

ART. I.—1. *Gosselin's Power of the Popes in the Middle Ages.* London: Dolman, 1854.

2. *Roscoe's Lives of Lorenzo de Medici and Leo X.* London: Bohn, 1853.

3. *Life of Savonarola.* By Dr. MADDEN. London: Newby, 1853.

4. *Ranke's History of the Popes.* London: Bohn, 1853.

5. *Machiavelli's History of Florence.* London: Bohn, 1851.

TO CATHOLICS there can scarcely be a subject of deeper interest than the character and the conduct of the Vicars of Christ—especially during the periods for which they respectively occupied the Chair of St. Peter: not because, as Protestants often ignorantly imagine, that the personal character of Pontiffs can possibly affect the argument as to their divine mission and supremacy, but because the question is one at all events of a painful and sorrowful scandal, which it must surely be, to a truly Catholic mind, a joy to be in any degree able to remove. And even apart indeed from any peculiar interest which Catholics cannot but feel in the question, it has an attraction of its own, founded on the noblest and most generous feelings of nature, which delight in the rescue of any great character from the rancorous tooth of calumny. As it is one of the meanest and most malignant tendencies of the human mind which disposes it to pharisaical detraction or slanderous denunciations, so it is an instinct of justice which should never be neglected, and a dictate of charity which should ever be cherished—to vindicate the victims of calumny, and rescue them from their load of unmerited obloquy. It is a noble exercise of intellect to dissect the fabrications of malignant falsehood, and destroy the in-

ventions of hate, and it is one in which as Protestant authors have engaged in the generous spirit of chivalry, so any Catholic writer should be, under the sacred influence of charity, happy to enlist his utmost energies. Above all, it should be so in the instance of any who have sat on that sacred seat with which to associate aught of scandal or of shame must bring grief to the Catholic heart. And as in those ages in the history of the Church in which iniquity has abounded, and the "love of many has waxed cold," there have not been wanting parricidal children who have joined with her enemies to spoil and assail her, and to excuse or cloak their own iniquity, by impiety to her supreme Pontiffs, there are some of the Vicars of Christ whose characters have come down to us so blackened with calumny that candid Catholics and enlightened Protestants generally are equally ready to hold them up to execration as "bad Popes." On the Continent Catholic intellect has for some time been devoted to the noble duty of defending the calumniated Pontiffs. Gregory VII., who had long laboured under a load of obloquy, has been triumphantly vindicated. Hurter has done a similar glorious service to the memory of Innocent VIII. Catholic historians have done much, if not enough to place in its true light the conduct and the fate of that unhappy victim of a despot's violence, Boniface VIII. And even in our own days, for that most maligned of Pontiffs, Alexander VI., there have not been wanting illustrious sons of the Catholic Church, not in Italy, but in Germany or France, who have, (we refer to the words of Rohrbacher and Jorjy) in the true spirit of chivalry and charity, sought by a careful investigation of the truth to relieve his character from those foul hues with which calumny had blackened it. Thus, on the Continent, Catholics have awakened to this noblest of duties, and have begun to discharge it. It is, we regret to say, far otherwise in England. Hitherto, scarce any Catholic of eminent ability has treated of the characters of the calumniated Pontiffs in this spirit and with this object; indeed, one might almost say, (and certainly one of the works at the head of this article substantiates our remark,) if they have written at all it has been to reproduce the hacknied calumnies they ought to have exploded, and repeat the slanders they should have rather rejoiced to refute. It is sad, but true, that if the characters of any of these Popes have had any degree of justice done to

them, it has been rather by Protestant than Catholic writers, and in connection with the family of the Borgias the name of Roscoe may serve to put some Catholic writers to shame. For ourselves we are proud to follow in this noble work—humbly and at a distance—in the footsteps of some of the finest geniuses, who, in Germany or in France, have dedicated themselves to the elucidation of these most painfully interesting periods in the history of the Papacy. We will not tamely yield up the characters of some of the ablest pontiffs who ever sat on the Chair of St. Peter to obloquy and infamy, and foul traditions of calumny. And at the era of the establishment of a Catholic university we think it may be well to direct the attention of the great minds to whom its studies of history may be entrusted, to a theme, in our conception, worthy of the noblest efforts of Catholic intellect.

It surely must soon strike any but very superficial students of history, that those pontiffs who have been most assailed by calumny have been those who were engaged in the most violent struggles with secular princes: sometimes in their exercise of the spiritual supremacy of the Holy See; sometimes in defence of those territories which constituted its patrimony. It is chiefly in contests of the latter class that the so-called "bad popes" were engaged; and although some of those who are represented as *proud* were those who had to contend for their supremacy—those who are stigmatized as *depraved* were involved in struggles for their sovereignty. And it is the root and essence of the whole system to consider that the Popes were from the earliest periods—from the age of Constantine and Valentinian, princes as well as pontiffs, with rights of temporal property and secular sovereignty.

It is necessary to cast our eyes on the origin of that state of society in Italy which existed during the days of the Pontiffs to whom we principally refer. Its origin is to be traced to the fall of the Roman Empire. We will cite no partial authority. Guizot tells us that "everything was cast into barbarism," and that the Church "was forced to defend herself on all sides, for she was continually threatened." He adds, in words to which we call attention—"Each bishop and priest saw his barbarous neighbours incessantly interfering with the affairs of the Church, to usurp her riches, lands, and power." "On the death of Charlemagne," he proceeds, "chaos commenced: all unity dis-

appeared, and the desire for independence and the habits of feudal life severed the ties of the ecclesiastical authority." Elsewhere he describes the feudal spirit—"the nobility regarded themselves as not only independent of the Church, but as superior to it—as *alone called upon to progress, and really govern the country.*" He goes on to say, "at the commencement of the fourteenth century the Church was upon the defensive." He notices that the "boroughs in Italy were more precocious and powerful than anywhere else. With the inconsistency which can always be detected in your "enlightened" writers, i. e. writers so "enlightened" as to hate the Church, he tells his readers in one page that the "theocratic system of the Church failed, and gave place to that attempt at democratical organization of which the Italian republics were the type, and which from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries played so brilliant a part in Europe," taking care to add that "the emancipation of the European lay society really dates" from that era, and in almost the very next page, describing these republics he says,—“in the political system of the greater part of the republics liberty continually diminished.” “The want of security,” he says, was such, “that the factions were inevitably forced to seek refuge in a system less tempestuous, though less popular, than that with which the state had commenced.” “Take the history of Florence, Venice, Genoa, Milan, Pisa; you will everywhere see that the general course of events, instead of developing liberty, and enlarging the circle of institutions, tended to contract it, and to concentrate the power within the hands of a small body of men. In a word, in these republics, so energetic, brilliant, and wealthy, two things were wanting, *security of life*, (the first condition of a social state) and the progress of institutions.” So that the only result of the destruction of the power of the Church was—to destroy security for liberty, and prevent the progress of free institutions; and yet we are gravely told that “from that event dates the real emancipation of Europe.” And to crown the inconsistency, the learned writer elsewhere laboriously proves that the system of the Christian Church was the source of real popular liberty! Such are your “enlightened” writers! On such a state of society as he describes the Popes of the twelfth, thirteenth, and

fourteenth centuries" were cast, and also *among writers such as he*. He remarks, as the reason for the superiority of the Italian towns, (that is, in point of power) that the "fief holders," in other words the nobles, settled in the cities. "Barbarian nobles became burghers." We may add, what indeed follows from what he states, that the noble burghers were barbarians. There were never more barbarous ruffians to be a curse to any country than these Italian bandits, as we shall see in the sequel.

It is at the basis of the whole question whether the Popes or their opponents were strictly in the right as respects those struggles for territorial possessions, which form the chief scandal of the age of Sixtus and Julius—the age more immediately preceding the Reformation. This is not as the question of mere temporal power, one of difficulty, it is a simple question of property, a dry matter-of-fact. The point is, who were the lawful owners of the territories in Italy, which, before or during the schism of the Papacy, had been lost to the Church, and which, after the return of the Popes, were reclaimed by a succession of energetic pontiffs, as belonging to the patrimony of St. Peter? Of course, to a Puritan, who professes to hold that there ought to be no Papacy, and no ecclesiastical endowment at all, this can be no question; or it will be a knot he will soon cut with the sword of confiscation; exactly as it was cut in those very days by rapacious princes, who preferred possessing themselves of the lands of the Papacy rather than permit her purity to be imperilled by the possession. But to a Catholic, or even a Protestant, who defends a Church Establishment, and admits that a Prelate or Pontiff may, as such, have property, the primary question must be, whose were these territories of Italy? Now, we reply, they were the *Pope's*. So early as the time of Pepin, we find that the Pope was endowed with territories comprising, not only Romagna, but Ravenna, Rimini, Pesaro, Sinagaglia, Forli, and many other places. "The origin, moreover," says Dollinger, "of the states of the Church sprang from the *necessities of the times*." The gift of Pepin, therefore, was without doubt in conformity with the wish of those who were included in it, and the real sovereignty of the Popes was already so widely extended through the territories above named that the gift is named by many contem-

porary historians as "an act of restitution."* The seven cities of the "Pentapolis" pertained to the Papacy, including Bologna, Imola, and Ancona. And Charlemagne confirmed the gift of his father, and added several provinces in the north and centre of Italy, comprising the dukedoms of Spoleto and Benevento, and some portion of Tuscany. There is strong reason to believe that the whole of Tuscany was originally part of St. Peter's patrimony: it is mentioned as such by historians; down to the thirteenth centuries we read of vicars of Tuscany. And in 1278, Pope Nicholas III., who received solemn confirmation from the Emperor of the territories above-mentioned, exercised sovereign jurisdiction over Tuscany, the vicariate of which was resigned to him.† And the real truth of the matter as regards the contests in which the Popes, during the two succeeding centuries were involved, for the defence or recovery of their territories is this,—that the "vicars" who had been appointed to rule those territories on behalf of the Papacy, rebelled against the Holy See—usurped a power which they cruelly abused; and by the dreadful atrocities they perpetrated upon the poor people who were the subjects of the Holy See, made it as much a sacred duty as a right upon its part to seek to put down such usurpations, and recover their lost dominion.

Very early in the history of the Papacy we perceive the existence and the influence, and we will add, the motive malice of calumny. Take the instance of John XII. He, with the concurrence of the bishops and barons of Italy, seeks the aid of Otho, who swore that he would preserve uninjured the possessions and rights of the Roman See, and that he would protect the Pontiff and not intrude upon his sovereignty of Rome. Upon the faith of this oath he received from the Pontiff the imperial crown, which commenced the connection between the German and Italian States. This was the most solemn recognition of the title of the Pontiff, and it was accompanied by as solemn a confirmation of his right to Tuscany, Sicily, Romagna, Spoleto, Benevento, and the rest of the patrimony of St. Peter. Soon after obtaining imperial power, however,

* Translation by Dr. Coxe, v. 3. p. 114.

† Universal Hist. B. xix. citing Sigonius.

Otho proved faithless to his oath, and instead of protecting the possessions of the Papacy, acted in an opposite spirit, and with a view to self-aggrandizement. The Protestant writers of the "Universal History" tell us that "Otho claimed the sovereign power in Rome," in direct violation of his oath, and with utter neglect of the Pope, whereupon the Pontiff made an alliance with the view of expelling him from Italy. Then it is we find (we quote these writers) "Otho sent some of his faithful attendants to Rome, to enquire into the behaviour of John." One is forcibly reminded here of the commission issued by our Henry VIII. to one of his faithful attendants, "to enquire into the behaviour of the monks and nuns." The enquiries of such "faithful attendants" of princes are never fruitless. Otho's emissaries brought him back word that the Pope led a scandalous life; they were positively scandalized—"he really was a bad pope." Of course he was—because he would not let the Emperor Otho do as he pleased with what did not belong to him. And now, all of a sudden (just like our Henry VIII. again in the matter of his marriage with Katherine) the emperor conceived scruples as to the validity of the election of the Pontiff, precisely as, a century or so after, his successor, Henry IV. chose to conceive, or pretended he conceived, scruples as to the election of Gregory VII. And in the one case, as in the other, the poor pope was accused of simony. And under imperial influence a schismatical council presumed to assemble to depose him; the council being held, under the personal auspices of the Emperor, under terror of his troops, for he marched his army to Rome—drove the Pontiff away—and then impudently interpreted his absence as an evidence of conscious guilt upon a catalogue of monstrous charges coined against him, concluding with one about drinking the devil's health! Of the atrocity of these charges there is sufficient proof, in the simple fact that the moment Otho and his army withdrew, the Romans brought back their Pope, and reinstalled him. And this is the first strong instance of the class of calumniated Pontiffs called "bad popes." What is here narrated of John XII. will be admitted to apply to Gregory VII., and in our opinion it applies equally to Alexander VI.

Now, we grieve to say that Dollinger states the story of John XII., really as if all the calumnies against him were

true, though the simple historical truth is, that no one ever heard a word of these charges until the emperor had quarrelled with him, and sent his emissaries for the express purpose of "getting up a case" against him. And there is not a particle of honest, unprejudiced evidence against the Pontiff. This is the more to be lamented and deprecated, because Dollinger, speaking of the stories of the time of John X., says very truly that they may be justly suspected, as the only writer whose testimony can be given, is the credulous Luitprand, and then stigmatizes the document he cites as a satirical libel. Yet the charges against John XII. are "clenched," (so to speak,) by a story told by the continuator of Luitprand, on whom certainly the "mantle" of his lying spirit may be said to have fallen. Nevertheless, having just vindicated one pontiff upon the ground that the testimony against him was not credible, he proceeds to sacrifice another, (probably afraid of not being considered sufficiently candid,) against whom not only is there less credence, but none at all; nay, as to whom there is overwhelming evidence that the accusations were malignant calumnies.

Here is the true origin of the lying legends of our bad popes. They originated in an age of bad Catholics, and they are perpetuated by *candid* Catholics—Catholics too candid to be careful for truth—to say nothing of charity.

In the eleventh century, so clear was it that Sicily was a fief of the Holy See, that Nicholas II. granted it with the title of a dukedom to Robert Giscard; and in the next century we find Innocent II. raising the dukedom into a kingdom, reserving the fealty due to the Holy See;* as he had granted to the emperor in like manner the duchies of Parma, Mantua, and Modena. Roger, the new king, soon sought to cast off the yoke of fealty—influenced probably by the spirit which dictated the preaching of Arnold of Brescia—who taught that no ecclesiastic could hold endowments; a doctrine very favourable to sacrilege, and likely to be much encouraged by spoliators. It had, in fact, been long acted upon by lay princes—but was now for the first time proclaimed—by way of reducing sacrilege into a system, and making a theory for robbery. Ere long the Holy See was deprived of a great portion of its patrimony.

* Dollinger's History of the Church, translated by Dr. Coxe, vol. iii. p. 150. vol. iv. p. 3.

The emperors who had contests with popes about spiritual supremacy—merely for the sake of acquiring a hold on ecclesiastical property—now found a shorter, if less plausible species of spoliation. No longer content with retaining in their hands the lands of bishoprics—under pretexts of patronage—openly plundered the Holy See of its possessions. They were soon imitated by the kings of France and Spain, and a host of petty princes who originally had been tributaries of the Popes,—began by being rebels, and ended by becoming robbers.

It was against the satellites of the infamous Frederick II., who laid waste Spoleto and Ancona with Saracen troops, and tortured the inhabitants to death, that we first find a decisive instance of a pope appealing to arms. As Dollinger truly and drily observes, "the Pope's excommunication would here have been pronounced in vain—he therefore resolved to meet force with force, and by force of arms obliged the brutal and infidel invaders to fly." "This invasion by a papal army," adds the historian, "to which Gregory IX. found himself necessitated by his duty, to defend his own territories from the attacks of his enemies, was afterwards represented by Frederick as an unprovoked attempt to deprive him of his kingdom." And writers in the interest of the emperor doubtless would represent him on that account as a bad pope. But the question is, whether the Pontiff would have been performing his duty in permitting his own subjects to be "cruelly tortured to death" by infidel invaders, albeit in the pay and employ of Christians, worse than infidels. Let the question be calmly determined by the rules and principles of moral theology in the case of Gregory IX., before a "candid Catholic" comes to consider and condemn the cases of subsequent pontiffs, which we contend were perfectly parallel in this respect, although they have chiefly on this account been covered with obloquy.

Frederick of Germany and Charles of Anjou both alike formed designs of seizing the whole of the Papal territory, and effecting the subjugation of Italy: and the result of the intrigues thus raised was, that at the close of the thirteenth century the Papacy continued vacant for upwards of two years by reason of the contentions between the houses of the Colonna and the Orsini, who had been engaged by the rival factions, and the unhappy Pontiff who shortly after succeeded Boniface VIII. died a victim to the bru-

talities of a Philip le Bel with the aid of a Colonna.* Boniface figures as a "bad pope." But who drew his portrait? Partisans of Philip and friends of his foes—the Colonna. Candid Catholics, it is true, have engraved the false portrait and circulated it: it is to be seen in the pages of Dollinger. But truth is stronger than iron or brass, and ever proves in the end too powerful even for false candour to disguise it.

Half a century afterwards Innocent VI., the "zealous and the virtuous," as the candid Dollinger calls him, found the states of the Church divided into small provinces under tyrants, and upon the point of being lost to the Papacy. The Pontiff therefore sent a small army of mercenaries who in a short time restored the power of the Pope throughout the greater part of his dominions, with the connivance and assistance of the celebrated Rienzi, the idol of the Roman people; a sufficient proof that the measure, upon the part of the Pope, was one of which they firmly approved. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, as we find the "misery of Rome (and the Roman States) carried to the highest degree by the wild lawlessness and the endless feuds of the families of the rude nobles, the Colonnas, the Orsini, and the Savelli, whose bands of retainers plundered and murdered even the pilgrims"—who will pretend that it was not the duty of the Pope to repress these disorders by force of arms? Certainly, the people thought so, and her sway was restored by the great exertions of the popular tribune and the papal vicar. Yet who doubts that the partisans of the Orsini or the Colonnas represented Innocent as a "bad pope?" and if printing had been invented, it would probably have branded him for centuries as such.

Well, Urban V. found himself compelled to ask Charles IV. to subdue the atrocious Bernabo Visconti, the tyrant of Milan, who oppressed Bologna, and was subjecting to himself the territories of the Pope. Yet Urban was devout and meek: a humble and holy monk.

In the times of his successor, Gregory XI., there was a general revolt of the States of the Church, fomented by

* *Colonnienſium domus auxilia domesticis, moleſta vicinis. Romanorum Reip. impugnatrix. Sanctæ eccleſiæ Romanæ rebellis urbis et patriæ perturbatrix conſortis impatiens, ingrata beneficiis, ſubeſſe nolens, præeſſe neſciens, humilitatis ignara, plena furoribus, Deum non metuens nec volens homines revereri, habens de urbis et orbis turbatione pruriturum.* Bull of Boniface, VIII. 10 May, 1297.

the Florentines, towards the latter part of the fourteenth century.

We may say, in the language of Schlegel, that the real point of transition, in Italian history, from good to evil, from those Christian principles which were ever predominant in the earlier period, to the unappeasable contests of the Guelphs and Ghibellines in the later middle age, must be fixed in the reign of the Emperor Frederick the First. With unrelenting severity, (says the illustrious writer,) and with atrocious cruelty, this Ghibelline emperor destroyed the confederate cities of Lombardy, and crushed the fair plant of Italian civilization, just then beginning to bloom. Ignorant and prejudiced writers often talk of the Papacy as having, by its influence, "blighted" Italy; indeed, this is one of the cries of the age. Let them mark such striking testimonies as those of Schlegel and Guizot. Our subject has a close connection with that interesting question: who can be considered responsible for the obstruction or destruction of civilization during the dark turbulent times to which we refer? Not Popes, but Emperors; not the spiritual power, but the temporal, "crushed the fair plant of Italian civilization." Guizot shows how the Church was the parent of civilization. Schlegel shows how it was crushed by the enemies of the Church. And our subject will illustrate the fact. "Although," says Schlegel, "the last Ghibelline Emperor, Frederick the Second, had been educated by Pope Innocent III., a Pontiff distinguished by his enlarged views and great intellectual endowments, yet the old dispute broke out again, under this monarch, with more violence and implacable animosity than ever. The quarrel was nevermore appeased, at least during the sway of Frederick II. and his family; and it terminated only with the downfall of the Hohenstaufen. Yet the Ghibelline name, heretofore stamped in characters of blood upon the earth, subsisted for a long while; and for ages after the Ghibelline spirit continued to be the prevailing one in Europe. The later princes of the Swabian family all resembled each other in unbending sternness of character. Henry VI. perpetrated the most enormous cruelties at Naples. The blood shed by Ezzelin, while governor of Lombardy under Frederick the Second, left behind him so fearful a recollection, that the last of the family, Conradin, was an innocent victim of the public hatred borne to his ances-

tors, and perished on a scaffold at Naples by the hand of Charles of Anjou, who had seized on the Sicilies."

There is a remarkable observation of the modern historian of Florence, which embodies a great fact illustrated by the whole history of the Papacy in the Middle Ages. When the Florentines were in dreadful apprehension of an attack from the excellent Galeazzo Visconti, (the object of Poggio's eulogy,) we are informed by the Protestant historian that they looked in vain to every quarter for assistance: "the Pope alone remained—and as it was thought *his own interest would lead him to right conclusions*—every endeavour was exerted to secure his aid." These involuntary admissions on the part of Protestant writers—unhandsome—uncandid—uncharitable as they are, are invaluable. It is evident that in the passage we have just cited, Mr. Napier was desirous of stating a fact extorted from him, in the way least favourable to the Papacy. The plain fact was, that in this, as in every other instance, in those times of violence, oppressed humanity turned towards the Papacy instinctively for aid. The Protestant historian cannot disguise the fact—he seeks to insinuate his own reason for it, and refers to it as simply the result of a sagacious regard to self-interest on the part of the Popedom. Well moralists teach us that all virtue consists in a due regard to self-interest; but taking it even at the lowest—such a well-regulated regard for it as led to a regard for the interests of others was rare in those days, and has been rare ever since; and we venture to say has never been constantly and consistently exemplified in any other institution but the Papacy. Setting aside, however, all supernatural sanction or mission, we believe that the Papal supremacy could be triumphantly sustained upon the very principle thus put forward by the able Protestant writer—that on the whole and in the long-run it would always be perceived that "the interest of the Papacy would lead it to right conclusions." The reason is obvious. Its only chance of support upon human principles is the confidence entertained in its integrity, incorruptibility, and impartiality—and the loss of its character, for those attributes would, humanly speaking, be its destruction. It has never lost that character, and to this day the conviction is general which prevailed amongst the Florentines five hundred years ago, that the interest of the Papacy would lead it to right conclusions.

The Florentines fancied that their interests would be promoted by taking part at this crisis with the foes of the Church, and all the ecclesiastical cities were incited by her to revolt. This is the statement of Napier.* "Florence," he says. "under the motto of 'Libertas,' declared herself ready to support unconditionally," (i. e., right or wrong,) "any ecclesiastical city that desired its freedom," i. e., wished to rebel. In plain English, the Florentines conspired to rob the Church, and of not less than eighty towns did they thus plunder the Holy See. Pope Gregory was again compelled to enlist mercenaries. The Protestant historian is again horrified. Still he is obliged to add that "before commencing he offered to desist if the Florentines would only leave Bologna and discontinue the war."† In other words, he only desired to defend his subjects from unscrupulous marauders, and was ready to forgive the past if they would only stop their career of plunder. It appears hardly credible, did we not read it with our own eyes it would be utterly incredible—that men like Napier should, notwithstanding all this, represent the Holy See as the aggressors, as the assailants in this struggle for its temporal possessions; and as responsible for the miseries it occasioned! Well, the Pope excommunicated them. In the ages of faith this was considered serious, and a deputation from Florence waited on him, and a scene of crimination and recrimination ensued—at least so say the Protestant historians—in whose pages—(even taking Mr. Napier's account)—it is impossible not to see that the Pope had the best of it. How could it be otherwise? as the facts would speak for themselves. "You Florentines," said the indignant Pontiff, "marched your armies to Perugia and Bologna, to besiege the citadels of the Church and expel her governors:—this is not defending yourselves from aggression, but doing violence to others. And what shall we say of the cities in La Marca so distant from you? Surely not fear or despair! but a hatred of the Church could move you to make them revolt! It was not only to diminish the ecclesiastical authority in Italy, but to destroy it, that you thus acted. And yet you call yourselves children of the Roman Church!" Here the Pope had them; and here the Papacy

* Vol. II. p. 380.

† Vol. II. p. 384.

has all bad Catholics—we beg pardon—candid and enlightened Catholics, who are found fighting or writing against the Holy See. In *them* it is treason:—treason to their own professed convictions—a betrayal of their pretended principles, and they are in a dilemma between hypocrisy and iniquity.

It was at this period that the Florentines (“to show their anxiety for peace,” say the Protestant historians, and the candid Catholics, but, as the result plainly proved, merely to make use of a Saint, in order to escape the terms their nefarious conduct merited,) induced the Blessed Catherine of Sienna to attempt to bring about a reconciliation with the Pope, who at once “gave her full powers to treat.” These were the words of Mr. Napier,* and he little thought how triumphantly they vindicated the character of the Pontiff. He gave a saint full powers to treat. Then how was it no peace ensued? Clearly it was not his fault. It was because she dealt with sinners, with bad and wretched men, who wished not for peace, but a sword. The people, indeed, desired peace, and this the Pontiff knew, and for their sakes was anxious for it. But their crafty leaders prevented it. Mr. Napier tells us that “all that Gregory required was the deposition of these men, and then Florence might have peace on her own terms.” Again we say, little did the Protestant historian imagine how these words vindicated the Pontiff he was so eagerly assailing. All that the Pope wished was to rid Florence of the bad men who, for their own base purposes, kept her plunged in an unprincipled war. They, of course, strove, by all the arts of unscrupulous misrepresentation, to maintain their influence; and in the face of flagrant facts, and in manifest inconsistency with their own confessions and admissions, your “enlightened” Protestants, and “candid” Catholics, adopt all their mendacious representations, and their sinister calumnies. And yet the very next chapter of the historian commences by a confession that Florence could not secure herself for a moment from the heartless tyranny and struggles of domestic faction.† Unfaithful to the Church, rebellious to the Holy See, the prey of unprincipled and depraved

* Vol. ii. p. 403.

† Napier, vol. ii. c. xxvii. p. 407.

men, how could she? Mr. Napier describes with power the dreadful reign of terror which prevailed in this unhappy city until, in 1379, Salvestri de Medici rescued her from her sad fate, and gave her something like peace, founding, at the same time, the fame, the fortunes, and the glory, of his illustrious family.

As it was in Florence, so it was in France:—"In France," says Schlegel, "which now took up that attitude of hostility towards the head of the Church which the Emperors had once assumed, an entirely new era in European policy, which had now ceased to be "Christian," (pregnant words! expressing a fact followed by fatal results, and for which not the spiritual, but the temporal power, was responsible,) commenced with the reign of Philip le Bel, (a worthy predecessor of Louis XI.) who fixed the Papacy at Avignon." "It was a deep-laid plan of policy on his part, in order the more easily to extort their consent to all his selfish projects; a policy by which the Popes were kept, during seventy years, in a state of absolute dependance on the court of France." During those seventy years, as we shall see, the Holy City was thrown into a state of disorganization and misrule, which it required stern measures, a century or two afterwards, to remedy; and this is the key to the history of what are called the "bad popes" of that age. "And when at last one of the Popes succeeded in rescuing the chair of St. Peter from this Babylonish captivity, and placing it again at Rome, Popes were abetted one against the other at Rome and Avignon; and a schism broke out in the Church, which lasted for forty years, till it was finally quelled by the General Council of Constance." This was, of course, followed by consequences still more fatal; it shook the faith of Europe in the Divine Mission of the Papacy as the source of Catholic unity, and probably tended, more than any thing else, to produce that spirit of disrespect for the Holy See, which, developed in the Reformation, had been working for a century before in Christendom; and the bad character of the spurious popes, along with the calumnies which the patrons of these miserable puppets disseminated against the true successors of St. Peter, brought odium and disgrace on the sacred chair, which ought to have been ever viewed with pious veneration.

"The great wealth of the Church," says Schlegel, "was

not the sole, but one of the principal subjects of dispute with the secular power, and was even "a stumbling-block to many." How could it be so, except from the rife spirit of cupidity and envy? It is hard to imagine otherwise, since that illustrious writer, supported by such enlightened Protestants as Guizot and Hallam, testifies that this "wealth had furnished the means of cultivating and fertilizing the soil of Europe, and sowing the seeds of science in the human intellect," (albeit under a religion which we have of late years learned, tends to "stifle the intellect and degrade the soul,") and he adds, "that this wealth the clergy generally employed in a manner the most praiseworthy and the most conducive to the welfare of the community;" as who can doubt, who recollects the mediæval maxim that it was better to live under the crozier than the lance, and who calls to mind the innumerable colleges, hospitals, cathedrals, and schools founded or augmented by episcopal or clerical donors? "The annals of modern Europe, and the history of every great and petty state within it, are full of the high political services which the excellent Churchmen of the Middle Age rendered to the public weal. It is easy to conceive that all the members of the higher body had not rendered services equally eminent, and that the employment of their riches had not been equally laudable." "It may be easy to conceive this," but we are not aware of any well-attested instances in which the employment of wealth by Churchmen was not better than its use by the laity of the times. Schlegel says, however, "independently of individual abuses and scandals, the great wealth of the dignified clergy, the eminent and splendid rank they occupied in the state and in society are ever a stumbling-block to the people;" (no, not to the people, for they found friends and benefactors, in the bishops and their protectors against the barons, and it was not the people but the rebels who regarded them with envy and jealousy, "and even to some ecclesiastics," (who envied wealth and rank they did not possess themselves,) in contradiction with the original rule and evangelical poverty of the primitive Christians—a hypocritical cloak, the cloak for cupidity, which lusted for the riches of the Church—riches which the history testifies were only held in trust for the poor, and were nobly expended in works of charity, hospitality, and piety.

The general statement given by Guizot is true through-

out the whole of the period referred to: true as well of the times of Boniface VIII. as of Alexander VI.; true alike of Philip-le-Bel and Charles VIII. of France; true of the turbulent and truculent barons of Italy, on whom their intrigues were practised, and who in turn practised their intrigues or depredations upon the Holy See. During the whole of this period the Popes were in the condition of the man in the parable—thrown among thieves. Literally they were surrounded by robbers; whose unscrupulous aggressions they had continually to resist; and if they resisted at all successfully were slandered by those servile writers whom they had in their pay. The great houses of Rome, the Colonna and the Orsini for example, were perpetually making the papacy the subject of their intrigues—"malice, domestic and foreign levy." In the brutal outrages of Philip the Fair against Boniface, he had the Colonnas for his allies, and later still, in the same half century, we find a Colonna aiding an excommunicated emperor to be crowned at Rome. These rapacious nobles possessed themselves of the patrimony of the Church, and when dispossessed by an able Pontiff they are represented by unprincipled writers as oppressed victims of Pontifical rapacity! Let us just give an instance. In 1340 some of these ruffianly gentry submitted to the Holy See, (under compulsion) and restored the places they had plundered; whereupon they were, on their own entreaty, appointed vicars to govern these places, on their paying certain sums in compensation for their spoliations, on which Villani hypocritically exclaims, "Oh, avaricious Church! how art thou degenerated from the humble purity and holy poverty of Christ." The hypocritical cry of all who have spoiled the Church in every country and every age.

The historians of Italy, being always in the interest of the princes and nobles, took care to represent the Pontiffs as the aggressors and oppressors, their own patrons as the innocent and the assailed; but the most candid student of Italian history can scarcely fail to see that this is a grossly mendacious representation. In the thirteenth century Pope Gregory IX., in a letter addressed to the Papal Legate, in the camp of the army which was defending the Holy See in the deadly struggle it then had to sustain against the Swabian dynasty, writes thus upon the question: "It is the will of God, that to protect the

liberty of the Church, humility does not prevent the defence of it by arms, provided that defence does not go beyond the limits which humanity prescribes." "For these reasons we command you to preserve from all injury those who fall into the hands of our troops, and to treat them, so that they may rejoice to have exchanged a state of culpable licentiousness for that of Christian captivity. You shall instruct our commanders henceforth to abstain from all kinds of violence, under the penalty of incurring our indignation." Such were the sentiments which the Holy See sought to inculcate among its defenders; such the spirit which it strove to infuse into them. What a contrast to the sanguinary atrocities of its assailants, among whom, amidst deeds of cruelty that make the flesh creep, we may search in vain for similar exhortations!

In 1370, we have it on Protestant testimony, that Pope Gregory XI. was undisputed lord of the "Patrimony" of St. Peter, of great part of the Romagna and of the dukedom of Spoleto, with Perugia and Bologna. A year or two after, we find Ambrogio Visconti, one of the knightly ruffians of the age, ravaging part of this territory, and the Pope compelled to impose a tithe on the Church in order to defend the possessions of the Holy See. And the very historians who narrate the story of this brutal aggression, speak of "rapacity," not of the assailant, but of the assailed. Ineffably odious is the hypocrisy with which Protestant historians (and Catholics who in their candour calumniate the Church quite as much) exclaim against the poor pontiffs for enlisting in their service, for the protection of their territories, some of those mercenary soldiers who were then the curse of Italy, and if they were not retained as defenders, were certain to be ruthless foes. Even Mr. Napier says, "The great lords of Italy had profited by the Pope's residence at Avignon to *usurp almost all the ecclesiastical dominions* in Romagna, La Maria, Spoleto, and the "Patrimony," everything had been occupied; the Malatesti (those monsters of cruelty,) "*with a swarm of lesser tenants, had usurped the sovereignty of numerous cities*, which it was necessary that the Church should recover, or abandon them with all her temporal power in Italy;" a loss, which of course a Protestant would not regret, but which a really enlightened Catholic knows would be as great an injury to the Church at large, as the plunder of the revenues of a diocese would be to its spiri-

tual subjects, or the sequestration of the tithes of a parish would be to its inhabitants; that is to say, it would be the sacrilegious appropriation, to purposes of rapacious plunder, of revenues dedicated to objects of piety and charity; and it would be wrong to overlook that in the case of the Papal dominions in the Middle Ages, it would involve the surrender of the subjects of the Church to the shocking tyranny of *fiends in human shape*, for such these tyrants were, whose rapacity is recorded even by Protestant historians, who, nevertheless, in the blindness of prejudice, speak with the same breath and write in the same sentence, of the ambition or the aggressiveness of the *Church*—the Church, which at the worst, did but defend her own.

If we do not desire to be the dupe of "lying witnesses," we must cross-examine the historians who testify against Pontiffs, and sift their character.* Take Poggio for

* Mr. Napier truly says, "Machiavelli's inaccuracy is notorious." Ammirato thus speaks of him: "His want of care is seen throughout his history. He changes years, *alters facts*, substitutes names, confounds causes, augments, diminishes, adds, subtracts, and lets his fancy run without a bridle, or any legitimate control; and, in many places, he *seems to act more from design than error or ignorance*; perhaps because by this he was enabled to write more elegantly, and less drily, than he would have done if obedient to dates and facts."—(Lib. 23, p. 96.) Bruto also says: "I follow Machiavelli when I can get no better authority; but where he wants sincerity, (which frequently happens,) or accuracy, I will not shield him."—(Lib. 2, p. 125.) And, be it observed, Bruto was a warm admirer of Machiavelli, and immediately declares himself to be so. Let it be borne in mind that the assailants of the bad Popes, especially of Alexander VI., make a liberal use of the name of Machiavelli when they can find a passage to suit their purpose, (although, after all, he records little, if anything, clearly attaching any stigma to their character,) while they pass over, or set at nought, any passages of a contrary tendency; and they utterly disregard the inconsistencies, or the influences, which affect his credibility. They eagerly quote his narrative of the conspiracy of the Pazzi, in order to support (which it really does not) their accusations against Sixtus IV., regardless that his history was written for one of the Medici, of whom he said, "I wish that the Signore Medici would employ me, if only in rolling a stone." And, on the other hand, they as eagerly quote the letters written, during his sojourn with Cæsar Borgia, in reference to the tragedy of Sinigag-

instance. He writes most dreadful things of Popes and Prelates, and particularly of Gregory XI., casting on him all the odium of the horrors which marked the war waged by the Florentines against the Church. Now how shall we test his evidence? Happily the means are not wanting of ascertaining the worth of *his* testimony to character, and of appreciating his *own*. There was a ruffian in those days, named Galeazzo Visconti, who transcended even the ordinary atrocities of that ferocious age. He signalized his career by the murder of his uncle and cousin, and then of *his own sister*, a lady of extreme beauty and innocence, whose only crime was beseeching him for their lives! His treachery and cruelty had in them something truly demoniacal. He, by forged letters, induced the husband of his cousin to murder her for supposed infidelity. This is but one instance of his crimes. Well, of this demon in human form, Poggio—the impartial Poggio, whom enlightened Protestants and candid Catholics quote with calm complacency, when he testifies against a Pontiff for defending his own territory from brutal aggressors, the impartial Poggio (aye, and Muratori likewise) can speak of the monster Galeazzo as great and sagacious, and *magnanimous* and *clement*! Verily it is almost sufficient vindication of the Papacy that it should be vilified by such men! Woe unto it when they speak well of it! So much for their testimony in matters moral. Let us take an instance of it in matters statistical: simple, plain, matters of fact and figures.

Of John XXII., who died in 1335, Villani, whose brother was one of the Papal Commissioners, states that he amassed 25,000,000 golden florins. We particularly note the circumstance that a Papal Commissioner, who might naturally be supposed to have official means of knowledge, thus states, as a fact, what there can be no reason to question is an extravagant falsehood. Albert of Strasburg, a *contemporary* writer, states the amount at 1,700,000 florins, a difference of *only* about 24,000,000! And Voltaire, a tolerably *impartial* authority on such a

lia, representing his testimony as unimpeachable, because he was the friend of Borgia; they well knowing that he was at Cæsar's court and camp as spy, rather than as friend; and as the envoy of his mortal foes, the Florentines.

subject, and sufficiently acute, questions the *possibility* of the larger sum *ever* having been amassed, especially in the course of a short period, and in turbulent times. Napier, the able Protestant historian of Florence, also disbelieves the extravagant statement of the Papal Commissioner, and sensibly observes that it is the less likely to be at all true, seeing that the far *smaller* sum stated by the other writer would, allowing for the difference in the value of money, nearly equal the larger sum in money of our own day. Now let the reader remark this instance; it is only an *instance* of the manner in which *contemporary* writers, even those who had occupied *official* stations in the Papal Court, permitted themselves to be led by the spirit of party, or from a desire to pander to the spirit of party in others, to speak of the conduct of a deceased Pontiff.

"When the Popes had returned to Rome from the captivity of Avignon, experience taught them how necessary to their dignity and independence was the possession of a sovereign principality, which, however inconsiderable, should at least be free from foreign controul. Nay, since the German Empire had become really extinct, or existed only in name, it was the interest of the secular powers themselves, that the political authority of the Pope within the Ecclesiastical States should rest on a firm and secure foundation, and should thus afford a guarantee that the Sovereign Pontiff who would not again be in a state of exclusive dependence on any one of the different powers, divided as they now all were in interests and enervated by mutual jealousy." This is one of the most important testimonies in history. It is a testimony to the necessity for the sake of the Church, and of Christendom—of the necessity of temporal possessions attached to the Holy See—the value to the world of St. Peter's patrimony. One would think it followed from this testimony that the possessions should be protected and that patrimony preserved. Yet, such is the force of prejudice, that even the illustrious Schlegel is not proof against it, and he immediately adds what neutralizes his testimony—"Without taking into account the personal scandals of Alexander VI., the mode in which some popes, especially of the Borgia family, sought to consolidate their power within the ecclesiastical territory, must have appeared very revolting in the spiritual heads of Christendom. And although Julius II.

possessed many great and princely qualities, still an injurious impression must have been produced on the public and popular mind when the chief ecclesiastic, a prince of peace, girded on the sword!" Very likely, on "the popular and public mind" of those who sought to profit by the weakness of the Papacy, and plunder it of its patrimony.

But the struggle that ensued in Italy during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, and in which the Papacy were involved on the return of the Popes from Italy, the great thing is to observe who were the aggressors. This is a point almost always and dishonestly shirked by writers on the Papacy—whether "enlightened" Protestants or "candid" Catholics. Thus, Ranke, who is particularly lauded for his impartiality, when he comes, at the commencement of his "*History of the Popes*," to describe the contest in which Sixtus IV., Alexander VI., and Julius II., engaged, represents it as an aggression on their part for aggrandizement of their dominions, although he well knew, and evinces that he knew, that it was simply a struggle for the recovery of the patrimony of the Church from the hands of spoliators. He himself says that the regions they sought to recover were "regarded as the patrimony of the Church;" and speaking of the part of Romagna which Sixtus strove to restore to the Papal States, says "that if the question were one of right, undoubtedly the Pope had the best title to it." But this admission, enormous as it is, is but half the truth. The case of the Popes in this matter rests not merely on property, but duty. It was not a case of mere territory to be recovered, but of subjects to be rescued. The tyrannical spoliators who had possessed themselves of the Papal territories were ruthless as lawless. They perpetrated abominable atrocities on the miserable people in their power, who groaned for deliverance from their brutal yoke;—and groaned for restoration to the gentle sway of the Church, whose yoke indeed was easy, and whose burden was light. Strange that candid Catholics and enlightened Protestants, albeit they are great lovers of liberty, and prate largely of humanity, have not charity enough to suppose that these considerations may possibly have influenced the Popes who sought to recover territories of which the Holy See had been spoiled.

The contests between Henry IV. and Gregory VII.,

and between Frederick Barbarossa and Alexander III., left in Italy deeply sown the seeds of fierce faction and perpetual strife, and in the pages of Dante we see vividly depicted the terrible fruits of the enmity between the Guelphs and the Ghibellines, and the constant struggle between the spiritual and the temporal, symbolized in the thirteenth century by the name of Boniface VIII., and in the fifteenth by that of Innocent III. Candid Catholics have been too prone to surrender such names to condemnation, as the names of "bad Popes;" and we have purposely mentioned the last, because the magnificent vindication of Hurter has, in our own days, supplied a striking proof of the extent to which this false candour has been carried, in cowardly deference to ignorance and prejudice. Machiavelli, writing of the close of the fifteenth century, gives us the key to a truthful view of this era in the history of the Papacy, the age of Innocent VIII., Sixtus IV., and Alexander VI. "To keep down," he says, "the Papal influence, the power of the Pontiff was secretly neutralized by engendering jealousies and hostilities, and causes of dissension in Rome between the principal houses of the nobility. Dissensions were sedulously promoted. The magnates of Rome were divided into two factions, the Orsini and the Colonnas; and pains were taken to have them with arms in their hands, so as to keep the Court of Rome weakened and disabled."*

As Napier says, "the various families of the aristocracy formed populous clans, all bearing the same name, and generally united for good or evil." Thus we read of one lord, who having five married sons, was, on the occasion of a private feud, enabled to assemble thirty cousins and nephews under arms. When feuds of this kind arose between such families, we can conceive the bitterness with which they were perpetuated from age to age, as, for instance, the feud between the Bianchi and Neri, in Florence, in 1300, which spread its poison through many succeeding generations, and altered the whole aspect of the city. Shakspeare, in his *Romeo and Juliet*, has left a striking picture of the deadly animosities resulting from such a system, in the hatred of the *Capulets* and *Monta-*

* Hist. Flor. cap. ii.

gues. A single specimen from real history will suffice to show the sanguinary spirit engendered by these strifes. One of the Pazzi, in 1312, was slain by one of the Cavalcanti, on account of the murder of one of the latter family by one of the former some years before. The Cavalcanti were instantly attacked by the Pazzi and their friends, and nearly fifty of them seized. The Pazzi, at the commencement of the fourteenth century, had slain Corso Donati, whom Machiavelli describes as "one of the rarest citizens Florence ever produced,"* and who was a friend of the Medici,—then, for the first time, rising into notice. The body of the illustrious chieftain was now taken from his tomb, and borne round the city by the adherents of his party, in order to inflame their enmity and inspire their thirst of revenge. But Corso himself, what manner of man had he been while alive—this *worthy* chief—this object of the eulogy of Machiavelli? We have more reasons than one for noticing the manner of man whom Machiavelli "delighted to honour." He had returned to Florence, after exile, under the protection of the infamous Charles of Anjou, to wreak his vengeance on his opponents. He was of the faction of the Neri; they of the Bianchi. "The Neri rode triumphant, says the historian, over the city; vagabonds of every description were let loose; the hand of murder was red; the torch flew rapidly; the Bianchi were despoiled; their daughters married by force; their sons slaughtered. Throughout this infernal drama the armed form of Donati was seen, like a fiend, at every turn seeking for the Cherchi, his opponents; and when food for murder, flames, and plunder, were exhausted in Florence, the still insensate maniac sallied into the country, and ravaged a whole district, without cessation or remorse, for eight whole days. Perjury, robbery, rape, torture, murder—such the results of the hatred, revenge, and anarchy engendered by these fearful feuds." The incidents seem hardly credible. "On Christmas Day the favourite son of Corso was *listening to a sermon*, when one of the Cherchi passed; the other flew after him, and slew him, without any quarrel, excited only by fiery blood and party-spirit—without preconceived plan, or provocation—in the midst of

* Machiavelli, Lib. ii.

a discourse from the pulpit on Christ's Nativity, and its blessings of peace and good-will towards men, suddenly determined to *murder his own uncle!** He succeeded, but *received a mortal stab from his expiring victim.*" What a picture of horror! And among such demons in human form the Popes had to govern the Church.

Just as it was in Florence, so it was at Rome. There, as the historian of Florence tells us, the long protracted absence of pontifical government had made Rome a scene of anarchy; the two senators, Orsini and Colonna, each with his own faction, were *hereditary and deadly enemies*. The streets were, in consequence, *infested with assassins, the roads with robbers*, and nothing but war and slaughter was seen in the Eternal City. This was in the middle of the fourteenth century. And while Rome was infested with robbers and murderers, the States of the Church were perpetually subjected to the atrocities of robbers and murderers on a larger scale. One of the chapters of Machiavelli is headed thus: "The Duke of Milan deceives the Pope, and takes many places from the Church."† The historian says, "the Duke resolved to take Romagna from the Pontiff, imagining that his Holiness (was so beset that he) could not injure him." This was towards the middle of the fifteenth century. The Duke is helped, we read, by one Niccolo, which Niccolo, after his son had pillaged Spoleto, (one of the Papal cities,) took Bologna, Imola, and Forli (also Papal towns); and of twenty fortresses held in that country for the Pope, "*not one escaped falling into his hands.*" Machiavelli observes pithily, but parenthetically, that this is "worthy of remark," and we think so too. He adds: "Not satisfied with these injuries inflicted on the Pontiff, he (the said Niccolo) resolved to banter him with words, as well as ridicule him by deeds, and wrote that he had only done as his Holiness deserved, for having unblushingly attempted to *divide two such attached friends as the Duke and himself.*" "Banter, indeed!" "Attached friends!" "*Arcades ambo,*" *id est*, ruffians both. Such were the princes and potentates among whom the lot of the Pontiffs of that age was cast; such the men from whom Sixtus IV., at the

* Napier, vol. i. p. 386.

† Hist. Flor. B. v. ch. iv.

end of that century, resolved to rescue those territories of the Holy See, which they had sacrilegiously stolen, and were cruelly oppressing. The long and the short of it is, the brutal spirit of Philip-le-Bel and Barbarossa had infected Italy, and the spoilers, who were robbed of their prey, revenged themselves by *calumny*.

The injustice to which the Pontiffs have been subjected who resisted aggressions on the territories of the Holy See, or strove to reclaim her just rights, is remarkable when we come to the age of Sixtus IV., who is described by Pauverno as a Pope of "immense cupidity;" whereas the truth is, that he was a Pontiff of extraordinary liberality, expending vast sums in the improvement of Rome; for which purpose, however, he laid on, it appears, heavy imposts, which may account for the enmity he excited in some quarters, while his efforts to restore to the Holy See its rightful possessions, excited the utmost hatred in others. Ranke tells us that Sixtus IV. was the first Pope by whom the project was first effectually undertaken of regaining these territories, which were the patrimony of the Church, and is compelled to confess that he had manifestly a better title than the princes who were possessed of them; yet, with the marvellous inconsistency which characterizes Protestant writers in speaking of the Papacy, he proceeds to reprobate his use of spiritual and temporal weapons in what he admits a rightful struggle. Those who were in possession of these territories were sacrilegious spoilers; and it is an affectation of humanity to be scandalized at the strenuous efforts of a Sixtus or a Julius to recover them for the benign sway of the Church, especially in an age when it was a saying that it "was better to be under the crosier than under the lance."

A most remarkable instance of the systematic unfairness with which the character of the Popes is assailed on the slightest surmise, without the shadow of evidence, is afforded in the conspiracy of the Pazzi against the Medici. That illustrious family happened, at that time, as constantly happened to the turbulent republic of which they formed the head, to be at enmity with the Pontiff; and the aim of the writers under their influence was to implicate him in the conspiracy, by representing Salviati, the Archbishop, as concerned in it, with the sanction of Sixtus. For the participation of the prelate, which is the

foundation of the charge against the Pope, there is not the pretence of proof. The republic were at variance with the Pope, and the Archbishop is charged with a mission from him to them, which it is pretty plain he was trying to discharge at the fatal moment when the conspirators attacked the Medici; for all the writers who record the fearful events of that day, mention his having, in his interview with the Gonfalonier, alluded to the Pope. Amidst the confusion and excitement caused by the attempted assassination of the Medici, the Gonfalonier, in a fit of sudden suspicion, or in a secret rage, which *simulated* suspicion, seized upon the archbishop, and instantly hung him, before it was possible to have had the least evidence of his participation in any conspiracy, least of all, of one so sanguinary. A deed more dreadful was never perpetrated; and the murder of the unhappy prelate is made at once the excuse for blackening his memory, and even as evidence against him. It is easy to hang men first, and then to accuse, and those who have hung will be certain to condemn; but candid men might suspect that, had there been reason to suspect his guilt, no execution could have been so sudden; and it is our opinion that his death was a deed of blood, casting the deepest infamy on those who *permitted* it, not less than on those who *perpetrated* it.

For proof of the incredible story we are referred to the statements of the "Synod" held for the purpose of criminating the Pontiff, (of which it is sufficient to say that the language is so atrocious, that it even shocks the Protestant Roscoe,) and the memorial drawn up by Bartholomew Scala, the Chancellor of Florence, that is to say, the tool of the Medici, who reigned paramount there. Both these precious documents are the *ex parte* statements of avowed enemies—of persons in notorious enmity with the parties they impeach; and of the one and the other Dr. Madden very justly says, that not a single proof is given of the Pope, Cardinal, or Archbishop, having participated in the conspiracy for assassination. He adds, "the evidence of tortured witnesses, and the confessions put in the mouths of tempted wretches condemned to death, are the foundation of the charge." It is perfectly plain to any truly candid person, that the real conspirators were the partisans of the Medici, who sought, with the vile spirit of the times, to murder the characters of those whom they had mur-

dered in person, and those who might be the avengers of their victims.*

Why have we mentioned this instance of the calumnies with which the Pontiffs were assailed? Because it is an illustration of the system under which Alexander VI. is gibbeted to execration by calumnies as groundless as atrocious. Principally upon the assumed fact of the murdered prelate's participation in the conspiracy, it is alleged by the partisans of the Medici, that the Pope had sanctioned it, that the Cardinal Riario was despatched to Florence, to direct the conspiracy, and Salvati, the Archbishop, was charged with the arrangement of all the details of the projected murder. Now, as Dr. Madden truly says, (and he is certainly not disposed to be too tender of the reputation of at least one Pontiff, or too reluctant to receive charges against him,) "*the whole of this statement rests on mere assertion*, with the exception of a conspiracy having existed for the murder of the Medici." And he adds, "that the idea of a pope sending a cardinal to the capital of another State to direct the execution of a number of murders of its rulers, (and charging an archbishop with the 'details of the arrangement,') is somewhat novel." The story is absurd; it is wholly incredible. "It was a hazardous mission for a cardinal to be sent on," says Dr. Madden shrewdly. "But what are we to think of the care of the Pope for a nephew?" (the Cardinal de Riario); and is it likely that he would expose a relation to the imminent peril of a failure, or discovery of the plot, (a peril too which the poor Archbishop found so fatal,) when any layman could have managed it with less danger of attracting attention?

Passing over Innocent's brief Papacy, Alexander VI. succeeded, and, we need scarcely say, is generally supposed to have surpassed him immeasurably in iniquity. He is, beyond all comparison, the worst or the best possible specimen of a so-called bad pope, or rather, as the writer believes, the most remarkable instance of the influence of ignorance, prejudice, and calumny. And

* It is worthy of observation that even Machiavelli, who wrote under the influence of the Medici, though he *represents* the Archbishop as implicated, states no single fact or overt act clearly proving his participation in the conspiracy, and does not say a word to imply a suspicion of any complicity of Sixtus.

for that reason we select him for our principal illustration of this evil influence; the more especially as in the article upon his great assailant, Savonarola, in a former number,* we abstained from any partial examination of the charges popularly preferred against him, in order that the whole subject might come in a complete form before the view of the reader. He is chiefly calumniated on account of his pursuing the course of which the blame is first ascribed to Sixtus, but a blame which he must share, if he deserves it, with other and earlier pontiffs, never stigmatized as "bad popes;" such for example as Gregory IX.—We speak of the efforts to regain or defend the temporal possessions of the Church. Except with respect to his natural children, of whom we will speak hereafter, this is the sole or almost the sole burden of reproach upon Alexander VI., and certainly it is the sole cause of it: for his energetic prosecution of the plans projected by his predecessor for the recovery of the patrimony of the Church, raised him the hatred of her princely plunderers and the herd of writers whom they patronized; and as the passion for political power in those days infected, as we shall see, even the breasts of pious friars, the political alliances or enmities in which he was involved, and the cloud of calumny in which he was inclosed, exposed him to the exaggerated or inflamed accusations of some of a nobler character, and among others of the celebrated Savonarola.

With the character of Savonarola that of Alexander is eternally associated. We must begin by protesting against the justice of this association. It by no means follows that if Alexander were not a bad pope, Savonarola incurred the guilt of a calumniator. It is quite possible to suppose that Savonarola might have been deceived, without supposing that he was a deliberate slanderer. Now this is the view which we purpose to substantiate. Of the earnestness, sincerity, devotedness, and enthusiastic asceticism of Savonarola's early career, we have spoken on a former occasion. But it now becomes our painful duty to follow him through the unhappy wanderings of his later life. It must not be forgotten that these are the very qualities which might naturally lead into extreme and exaggerated views. From the moment when Savonarola identified himself with the public affairs of Florence, he came to identify Alexander, and in him the

See of Rome with the political party to which he was opposed. Partisan intemperance came to the aid of religious enthusiasm, and was, in its turn, reacted upon by the very enthusiasm which it inflamed. He lent his ear, thenceforth, to the enemies of Alexander; he speaks from that moment only as their organ and exponent; and his statements, at first earnest and enthusiastic, but for this very reason, the more likely to run into exaggeration, gradually lapse into downright fanaticism, till in the end they lose all title to be received as the testimony of an impartial witness.

Indeed, we need not go far to look for examples for the eager impetuosity with which he caught up every hostile representation against the conduct and character of this Pontiff. We saw, in a former article, how, in justification of resistance to the Pope's authority, he pleaded the invalidity of his title to the Papacy. This plea, of course, rested on the obligation which has so often since been repeated, that Alexander VI. owed his election to bribery. The story is told with a show of circumstantiality. The bribes and the bribed are alike specified. For instance, (to select a single one,) it is stated by Guicciardini, that Ascanio Sforza was bribed by the gift of Borgia's private palace. Unfortunately for the story, however, it appears that the palace was given to Battista Orsini. Now, the falsehood of one part of a story so circumstantial, goes far to cast discredit on the rest. But this is not all. There is a probability from plain facts, of a natural and laudable reason for these supposed gifts. One of the Sforza family, and one of the Orsini, were Alexander's generals; and what more reasonable than that he should reward members of great houses in whom he reposed such confidence, and whom he commissioned for such services? It is Guicciardini who loads Alexander with wholesale abuse, and it is no more possible to place reliance on the assertions of Guicciardini, than on the statements of Machiavelli. All the accusations against Alexander, so far as relates to his conduct after his elevation to the Holy See, will, if carefully scrutinized, be found tainted with inconsistency or incredibility. His care to provide for his bastard children, as they are coarsely called, is made the chief matter of charge against him, with no care to examine whether they were not his lawful children by a marriage before he entered the priesthood; or if not, whether they were not

born many long years before his elevation to the Papacy—and whether that had not been followed by an alteration of character, which would not certainly have been indicated by his neglect and disregard of those who could scarcely have shared a criminality which preceded their own existence.

It may be necessary to premise a few observations as to the calumnies on the character of Alexander. He probably *had* been a profligate, but it was while he was in the army; and in an age of profligacy it was not wonderful that a soldier should have a mistress. This seems to have been the extent of his depravity, which is not only greatly exaggerated as to its degree, but as to its duration. It is always spoken of as transcending all the ordinary bounds of human debauchery, and as continuing down to the very period of his papacy; nay, as rising then, if possible, to a higher pitch of atrocity than ever. Probably, there never was so gigantic a calumny. He shared with some of the most illustrious saints of the Church the shame of early profligacy—before he entered into the prelacy. It is said that he secretly continued the same life afterwards, but of that there is no credible evidence—there is only the testimony of those enemies of his or of the Papacy, whose mendacity in other respects is clearly established. We repeat, there is no credible proof that he was profligate after he entered into the prelacy or the Papacy. His chief calumniator is Guicciardini, and he is obliged to admit, that in Alexander there was "singular acuteness and sagacity, excellence in council, and in all weighty matters incredible concentration of ideas and astuteness." Strange qualities for an impersonation of beastly debauchery, and for one degraded below the level of the brute. But we will enable our readers perfectly to appreciate Guicciardini. In order to impress all men with an idea of the unfitness of Alexander for the Papacy, he says that his election was disliked, partly on account of his "nature and qualities, which were known to many—and to one in particular—the King of Naples, who expressed his sorrow with tears." This is gravely quoted by Dr. Madden. Now, Ferdinand of Naples had ample reason to feel a sorrow on account of the election of Alexander, "because of his nature and qualities;" assuming Alexander to have been what the historian describes him—as "of singular acuteness and sagacity"—"marvellous excellence in council, and incredible

astuteness;" for, Ferdinand was one of the most unscrupulous assailants of the Papacy—one who was for ever intriguing to rob the Church of part of her patrimony, and whose sorrow, therefore, at the election of so able a Pontiff was the sorrow of a spoliator at the appointment of a powerful and skilful protector to defend, and deprive him of, his anticipated prey. It is the very historian who records the tears of sorrow which Ferdinand felt at the election of Alexander, who also records the intrigues which Ferdinand had eagaged in with Pietro de Medici, to get one of the Orsini possession of certain castles adjacent to the Pontifical territory, "for he considered it would be advantageous to him to have Orsini, who was a military man, and also a relative of his, in possession of such strongholds near Rome. For he always looked on the power of the Popes as capable of being made instruments of mischief to the peace of his kingdom, which was an ancient fief of the Holy See, and which extended for a great many miles along the borders of the ecclesiastical states." And the historian adds, "that he always made it a principal point in his policy to keep all, or at least the chief of the Roman barons under his controul." It is easy to appreciate the "tears of sorrow" shed by this politic prince at the election of a Pope of "marvellous excellence in council, and wonderful astuteness and sagacity." He saw he should have his match, and should not find it any easy task to attempt to overreach or to rob the Papacy.

Let us look a little into the aspect of Italian politics under the Popedom of Alexander. The Borgias were a new and rising family; a fact not sufficiently attended to, as accounting for their being the objects of universal envy, enmity, and jealousy, especially when pursuing a policy which peculiarly exposed them to the rage of those who now could not rob the Church with impunity. The more ancient and powerful houses of the Orsini and Colonnese were arrayed against him; his own subjects intriguing with Ferdinand of Naples to assail and despoil him. The Orsini were assisted by Ferdinand to purchase certain fiefs within the Roman territory, in order to aid them in their common purpose of embarrassing and embroiling the Pontiff. "These places," says Mr. Napier, "were, as well as most of the Orsini states, situated about Rome, Viterbo, and Civita Vecchio, and maintained a line of political intercourse with Naples; and the Pope thus saw

himself bearded in the heart of his dominions, by one of the most powerful barons, supported by two unfriendly states in close family connection, for Orsino was related to Naples; and it had always been one of Ferdinand's objects to possess some strongholds in the Papal territory that might connect him with the factions." Here is the case stated by a Protestant historian. And is it not palpable that the Pope was put upon the defensive—by misconceptions, aggression, and traitorous machination? In self-defence he assembled his forces—married Lucrezia, his natural daughter (before he was Pope) to the lord of Pesaro, who commanded them, and prepared to attack Orsino. In so doing he was acting most truly as a Pastor: he was rescuing his sheep from the wolves—his subjects from oppression. Ferdinand of Naples, in concert with Florence, attacked the territories of the Holy See, and Milan, its ally, invoked the aid of France, and brought down on Italy Charles of Anjou.

Now, who were the causes of all the disasters that ensued? Clearly the aggressors. And who were they? Clearly the unprincipled and rapacious Ferdinand and his equally unscrupulous allies, the Florentines. It was at this very period the influence of Savonarola was all-powerful in Florence, and so far from his influence being exerted against this unjust aggression on the part of his country, plain facts prove that he was its main mover. In other words, he was aiding and abetting an atrocious tyrant in an unscrupulous aggression on the proper rights and possessions of the Holy See. In short, he was, so far, a leader of rebels against the Holy See of Rome; not merely rebels, but robbers, leagued with one of the most ruffianly princes of the age, to rob and plunder the See of St. Peter. In our former article on Savonarola, it was shown that at this period he was certainly in a state of disobedience to the Holy See which could not be justified, and had imagined himself entrusted with a Divine mission and supernatural inspirations. It is into this portion of his extraordinary career that we now propose to pursue the melancholy narrative. In order to judge dispassionately of his portraiture of Alexander VI., it will be necessary to enter fully into every particular of his history; and we regret to say that it is impossible to study his character in this period of his life, without a painful conviction of the peril to which even the loftiest piety and the

purest purposes are exposed, under the influence of political excitement and popular applause. It is, however, in no spirit of scorn we desire to speak of that illustrious and ill-fated man; and we should check the inclination to do so, provoked by the misrepresentations of those who, in their haste to calumniate a Pontiff, heap indiscriminating eulogies on a demagogue. For, whatever Savonarola might have been, at an earlier period of his life, (and then we are sure that if not a saint, he was in the way to have become one,) at the time of which we now speak, he was merely an agitator, a schismatic, and a fanatic. He was in open rebellion against the Holy See, (as was shown by the writer of the article in Number lxiii.); and we shall see how he loaded his soul with the guilt of *murder* (at least by assent) in the wild pursuit of power. His was a noble soul: but so was Lucifer's: and he fell like Lucifer, by reason of that first and last of sins—"that last infirmity of noble minds"—the sin of pride. The ruin of such a soul is a theme for angels' tears; and the fate of such a man a fitting subject only for deep sorrow. In the whole of history we know not a more mournful and melancholy tragedy.* But there are stern lessons which truth must deduce from it, yet the requisitions of justice must be satisfied; nor must we suffer a false charity, or simulated candour to exalt one character for the purpose of degrading another. The truth must be spoken—the proofs we shall disclose—the plain fact is, that at this period Savonarola was an excited fanatic, had long been an agitator, and had ended with being an avowed schismatic.

Thus it happened that, from a variety of causes, the political sympathies of this enthusiastic man were all enlisted against the political position, in relation to Italian affairs, then occupied by the Papacy. Unfortunately, too, the character of Savonarola is inseparably associated with the character of the Papacy in his day; for this,

* We cannot help alluding to a strange fallacy of the admirers of Savonarola. They exult in this supposed fact, that St. Philip Neri kept his picture. Assuming this fact to be (as it is not) by any means adequately attested—can they venture to say that it was for veneration, or for warning? or if by way of veneration, was it for his *original* or his *ultimate* character?

among other reasons, that he constituted himself a witness against it. It is with him as with Wycliffe in England in that respect. In his later writings are to be found the most sweeping denunciations of the prelacy, the papacy, and the priesthood, of his age,—and he has, perhaps, more than any other, contributed to create the deep-seated impression which prevails as to the depravity of the Pontiffs and prelates of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries,—the centuries as to which historical truth is so important, seeing that they preceded that disastrous religious revolution—the Reformation. "Popes," he said, in the violent declamation of this period of his career, "have attained, through the most shameful simony and subtlety, the highest priestly dignity, and even when seated on the holy chair, surrender themselves to a shamefully voluptuous life and insatiable avarice. The cardinals and bishops follow their example. *No discipline in fear of God* is in them. Many believe in no God. The chastity of the cloister is slain, and they who should serve God with holy zeal have become cold or lukewarm." The obvious import of this sort of language—the language he ordinarily held, was, that this depravity was not exceptional, but general and universal. Now his own admirers admit that these sweeping demonstrations are utterly false; and their falsehood can plainly be proved from the facts of contemporary history and biography. Dr. Madden, whose admiration of his hero almost amounts to infatuation, admits this, and writes with great good sense in these terms by way of apology for such indiscriminating calumny. "It cannot fail to strike the readers of works of ascetic writers how the denunciation of universal iniquity becomes a ruling passion, so that they are apt to become forgetful of many exceptions to the prevailing degeneracy and corruption. We may be permitted to doubt if all religion had perished, or all its ministers had become faithless and unprofitable servants in Italy in the days of Savonarola." Now we attribute the impression so prevalent, that it was such an age, chiefly to these very exaggerations of Savonarola, and other less sincere and single-minded writers, principally secular, who had political objects to promote by these denunciations of ecclesiastical contemporaries. And we submit that a man who could permit himself to publicly preach such mischievous representations which his own

admirers admit to be sweeping and excessive exaggerations, *is not a credible witness.*

It is plain, indeed, that the leading defect of Savonarola's mind was want of self-control. He knew no moderation. He ran into extremes, even in reference to the common decencies of society. It was in the year 1490, that, at the request of Lorenzo de Medici, Savonarola was sent from Ferrara, and appointed Prior of the Convent of St. Marco, in Florence, of which Lorenzo was the patron, as he was of the city really the Prince. From the very first, as we saw in our former article, Savonarola treated him with a marked hostility, and even bitterness, of which we find no previous instance in his conduct to others, and for which it is hard to find an excuse. In the words of Dr. Madden, "Savonarola was informed that it was customary with all Superiors of Convents in Florence, on their appointment to the office of Prior, to make a formal visit to Lorenzo de Medici, as a recognition of his legitimate authority in his capacity as the head of the republic, and for the purpose of recommending to his protection their several Convents." But we learn from Burlammacchi, (a great eulogist of Savonarola,) "that he would do none of these things, at which the brethren were much surprised; and the brethren of longest standing in the Convent said to him, 'Such being the custom, in accordance with it, you ought to make this visit of ceremony, or otherwise great scandal will arise;' to which he answered: 'Who elected me Prior? God, or Lorenzo? It is the Lord I wish to thank, not mortal man.'" Now Lorenzo had *recommended* him to be appointed, and *requested* his appointment, and surely deserved, for this courtesy, a "customary visit of ceremony," especially as he was virtually sovereign of the city and state of Florence. Nor can we, when we recollect that the family of Lorenzo were founders of the Convent, and that he was its patron, fail to sympathize with his feelings when he said: "A foreign Prior has come to take up his abode in my house, and he will not deign to make me a visit!" However, Lorenzo, undeterred by this stern discourtesy, *went to see Savonarola.* Again and again he walked (as was usual) in the Convent Garden, hoping that the Prior would speak to him. But no. Savonarola wrapt himself up in stern isolation; and although Lorenzo left untried no means to soften him, and show his desire to be friendly with him, all he could

get was cold and curt replies to his kind courtesies, and repulsion and repugnance to all his charitable civilities. Now part of this proceeding is certainly to be ascribed to the rigid anti-Erastian notions which Savonarola entertained, and which he had come to Florence to enforce with all his characteristic ardour. But a great deal of it, too, arose from the same party-spirit of which we have been speaking. Lorenzo had his faults, perhaps his crimes, we are no enthusiastic eulogists of him, but his rule was received by the great body of his countrymen, and is recognized by the greatest writers of our own, or any other age, as on the whole salutary and just. His private character was reputable, his patronage of literature generous; his benefactions to religion showed a sense of piety, and spirit of devotion; and the charity and humility he displayed towards the man who treated him so uncharitably, towards one who was a recipient of the bounty of his family, and owed his position to his patronage, evinced that, with less of pretension to piety, he possessed more of the *magnanimous*, as well as the *magnificent*. He evinced no resentment at the rude treatment of Savonarola, and gave him no molestation; on the contrary, treated him with constant courtesy. The reward he received was systematic denunciation, and persevering enmity. Perpetually preaching, the Prior found a familiar theme in the regret of political liberty; and the drift of his discourses was opposition to the rule of Lorenzo, and dislike to the existing form of government in Florence.

It is impossible not to perceive that the pious monk had become smitten by the prevalent passion of the age, and especially of his own people, the passion for political power. In effect he played the part of an agitator. It is easy to say "that the monk of Ferrara, who began, we are told, at this time to show that he was ambitious, a self-seeker, ought, if his character and conduct are rightly represented, to make his court with the chief of the state, from whom all honour, wealth, and dignities, in the republic were to be derived." But we ask in return: is it of *princes* that patriots seek power? Is it not rather of the *people*? And is it not essential, in order to acquire popularity, to stand aloof from, and affect dislike and distrust for the *rulers*? Is not a haughty independence, a spirit of defiance towards those in power, the common policy of those who *desire to obtain* power, by acquiring

the reputation of despising it? Political preaching, of which the theme was popular liberty, were likelier means of acquiring popular influence than paying court to a prince; and discourses against tyranny the best and surest mode of winning popularity. It is not surprising that there were remonstrances against this style of preaching, and that its motives and aims were suspected. It is the more observable because, although in another year or two we find Savonarola a fierce declaimer against the Court of Rome, under Alexander VI., we find him now rather an assistant of the Medici, and hear nothing of Sixtus. Was this the reason, that Sixtus was at enmity with the Medici, whereas Alexander was in alliance with that illustrious house?

Anyhow, no admirer or defender of Savonarola can deny or dispute the fact that, from this time forward, he was a political agitator, and that his efforts were directed to a change of the form of Florentine government. For he himself avowed it, and evinced the aim and motive of his conduct at a moment, and under circumstances, when, if it had not been the force of a dominant passion which moved him, the decencies of humanity, the dictates of piety, and the duties of charity, would have kept him silent on the subject; but these were outraged and violated by his conduct. When the great Lorenzo lay on his death-bed, and humbled himself so far as to send for the friar, who had, during the whole period of his residence in the house which the kindness of Lorenzo had obtained him, pursued him with relentless rancour, Savonarola refused absolution or benediction except on three conditions, one of which was, that he should restore to Florence *the state of popular rule which belonged to a republic!* It is absolutely astounding that the admirers of Savonarola should be so carried away by their enthusiasm as not to be sensible of the inhumanity, the indecency, the impiety of this. Who made Savonarola the arbiter of the political rule of Florence, and by what code of theology does he make a republican system essential to salvation? How engrossed his whole soul must have been by political theories, to have made such an insolent requisition at the death-bed of an illustrious prince, who had acquired his power by no conquest save that of superior ability, and held it with the assent of the great majority of his countrymen.

Lorenzo, however, died ; and about the same time died Innocent VIII., (the successor of Sixtus,) whom Alexander VI. succeeded in the See of Rome. Alexander, who was on friendly terms with the family of the Medici, was at once involved in a contest for part of the patrimony of the Church, which exposed him to the enmity of several of the princes of Italy ; while poor Pietro, the son and successor of Lorenzo, found himself unable to face the fury of popular *liberty*, created by the political preaching of the friar. At the same period the Borgias were embarked in a war, (for self-defence,) and the Medici were involved in ruin, Savonarola the enemy of both. The palace of the Medici was sacked in a burst of popular rage, kindled and fanned by his influence ; and in that palace he, not long after, sat to sanction the murder of the friends of the family under whose patronage he first entered Florence ; and subsequently it was there that he waited on a fierce and ferocious king, invited into Italy, its scourge and curse, at his earnest instigation, in order to coerce, and, if possible, displace the Vicar of Christ. Let us look a little more closely into these passages of history ; they are closely connected. It happened that one of the supposed prophecies of Savonarola was the ruin of Pietro de Medici, the son of his benefactor and friend ; and certainly he did his best to verify it, principally by his intrigues with that infamous prince, Charles VIII. of France, by whose act he hoped to destroy the Pope. With marvellous fatuity his admirers repeat his "predictions" of an invasion which their hero had done and was doing his best to accelerate, and had long led his hearers to anticipate these "predictions ;" indeed, at the same time we find Savonarola was sending letters to Charles, and to other personages, doubtless including the "eminent ecclesiastics" before alluded to, in order to induce him to invade Italy, overawe Florence, advance on Rome, and thus at once realize the predictions of the prophet, promote his schemes of political power, and wreak his revenge upon a Pontiff who did not favour those schemes, and showed symptoms of a desire to discountenance his political preachings, and investigate his pretended gifts. But first we find Savonarola engaged in transactions nearer home. It is made no secret of by the admirers of Savonarola that he was on good terms with the infamous Charles of Anjou.

Very early in the Italian career of that monarch, we find Girolamo at the head of an embassy composed, as Mr. Napier remarks, of the citizens "most adverse to the Medicean power," waiting on the French king; and the observation made as to the composition of the embassy, sufficiently indicates its character and its object. It was moved by envy against the house of the Medici, and sought the aid of Charles to overpower it. He had long been indefatigable in his endeavours to bring down Charles on Italy, thinking it would—as it did—favour his schemes of political power, and enable him to supplant the hated family of the Medici. And it was in reference to this invasion that he appears most prominently to have assumed that gift of prophecy which forms so painful a feature in his conduct, because it is the last and most melancholy phase in his wild career of fanaticism. Pietro de Medici then ruled in Florence. Savonarola had long striven to supplant Lorenzo; he had been foiled by the father; perhaps he might succeed against the son. Pietro was not in league with the invader. Savonarola *was*. His fellow-citizens supposed precisely the reverse. They did not know his secret communications with the French invader. He allowed Pietro to do his best to make terms for Florence; then, by reason of his services, Charles managed to make better; and next, by his friends, so worked upon the people, for several years before excited by his continual preachings against the rule of the Medici, that they rose in one of their wild bursts of popular frenzy, seized on and sacked the palace of that illustrious family, and expelled the son of Lorenzo from the city they had embellished.

And now Savonarola had gained his object. The republican form of government was re-established in Florence. This was on the 9th November, 1494. In less than four years the retribution came—and in a similar burst of popular fury Savonarola perished. Of course the friends of the Medici were not disposed to acquiesce in their expulsion, and naturally enough became the enemies of Savonarola. Moreover, on recovering from their fury, the people were not satisfied with the result of their violent revolution. Dr. Madden sensibly enough observes, "The expectations of the people by whom revolutions have been made, and the form of govern-

ment altered, are always of a nature that render it impossible that they can be realized ;" not perceiving that thereby he pronounced the condemnation of the folly of Savonarola for labouring for years to bring about such a revolution. He adds, with remarkable candour, "The interposition of Savonarola in secular affairs, though intended by him to promote spiritual interests, produced results that were *ultimately favourable only to a faction.*"

Very soon it appears, even the republican rulers who had been placed in his power by his preaching, began to complain of it. Most improperly political must have been its character to provoke such an interposition upon the part of those who had so profited by it. Yet the Gonfalonier was the first to promote proceedings against him on that account. The fact is, it was plain that Savonarola at Florence wanted to play in this respect the part of Calvin at Genoa.

Now, let us look a little to the circumstances attending the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII. of France, which has so important a bearing upon the character of Alexander and Savonarola. No one can question what kind of character was Charles. When, therefore, we read, as Corso says, that he had concerted with several of the most eminent ecclesiastics to deprive Alexander of the pontifical dignity, not only by the employment of force, but by the convocation of a council for the purpose of his deposition—a proceeding we need scarcely say, as insolently schismatical as any that had ever been attempted by Henry IV. of Germany, by Philip-le-Bel of France, or by Henry VIII. of England, we can easily conceive that one so impious and unscrupulous would stick at no means, however profligate, for the accomplishment of his ends, and that the "ecclesiastics" and writers in his interest would resort to the most envenomed and malignant slanders to blacken the character of the Pontiff they had schismatically conspired to depose. What mission had the French king or the "eminent ecclesiastics" to invoke a council? What cared he, or they, for simony or depravity—he among the most depraved persons of the age—and they, if his charges were true, the very men who had simoniacally elected Alexander? It is obvious that the extravagant accusations against Alexander were pretences to disguise the real object of the conspiracy for his deposition; temporal aggrandizement, which Charles

as much hoped to facilitate by the substitution of a more subservient Pontiff, as Philip-le-Bel had hoped in the case of Boniface VIII. And in the unprincipled aggression of princes like Ferdinand of Naples, and Charles of France, we see the real source of the slanders upon the Pontiff whose abilities they feared.

Yet, even Dr. Madden is compelled to admit "that the qualifications of the king of France to pronounce judgment on the faith or morals of a pontiff were more than doubtful," adding, "that eminent prelates and dignitaries sought his aid and co-operation for the execution of their project to depose Alexander seems to allow of no doubt." None at all. Now, as they knew the infamous character and unscrupulous aims of Charles, whose aid they sought, and as among the means the conspirators used, were the most atrocious slanders—slanders of which, the absurd incredibility of some, and the contradictory character of others, and the proved and palpable falsehood of several, cast discredit on the rest, and sufficiently show the character of the assailants,—what can we think of the "eminent ecclesiastics" who were the coadjutors of a prince such as Charles—for a purpose so schismatical—pursued by means so infamous and unscrupulous? And among them was Savonarola. Thus it is that the character and career of this remarkable man is associated so inseparably with those of Charles, on the one side, and of Alexander on the other; and, as we shall soon see, also intimately mixed up with the fate and fortunes of the family to whom he owed his introduction to Florence, and the influence he had ever used against them.

Audin, in his *Histoire de Leon X.*, gives us the true clue to the hatred entertained against Alexander, when he records, that soon after the death of his predecessor, more than two hundred homicides were committed within the walls of Rome, *by two or three families*, who had the privilege of shedding blood with impunity, because, practically, Rome belonged to them. He gives the reasons: "The long sojourn of the popes at Avignon," one of the worst results of the fatal schism in the Papacy, (mainly brought about by the intrigues of secular princes,) "the schism that had broken out on their return to Italy, and the scandalous disputes of the council at Basle," chiefly caused by the same evil influences, "had admirably served the purposes of the great vassals of the Holy See. Shel-

tered from punishment these feudatories had constituted themselves independent sovereigns." Now, Alexander, the Pontiff, of marvellous sagacity and astuteness, was not the sort of man to suffer this shameful system, while, as we have seen, the princes of other neighbouring countries were willing enough that it should continue, as theirs was the *parricidal* policy of perpetuating divisions in Rome for the purpose of weakening the Papacy. Thus, says Audin, when Charles VIII. invaded Italy, most of the great lords came to offer their services to the conqueror. It was not the fault of Alexander that Charles crossed the Alps. We know now, thanks to the learned researches of Roscinini, that the Pope tried in vain to hinder the alliance of Sforza with Charles VIII., and proposed a triple alliance with Rome, Milan, and Naples, which would have rendered the invasion impossible.

Two powerful houses hastened by their defection the occupation of Rome, namely, the Colonnas and the Orsini, and delivered up by a base treachery the patrimony of St. Peter to the French. In all emergencies the Orsini and the Colonnas were sure to find a refuge in the State of Venice, for the policy of that republic was ever interested in having Rome under the government of a weak and infirm pope. Ah! and it was the "policy" of other states besides Venice,—the "policy"—the parricidal policy of all the states of Italy by turns. Florence, Venice, Milan, and Naples—all plunderers of the patrimony of St. Peter, or ready to be so, or, at least, to make use of it for the purposes of their political intrigues and petty plans of self-aggrandizement. Among these men was the lot of Alexander cast. Is it not easy to understand how and why they must have disliked so able a Pontiff, one so disposed to defend the territory of the Church, and repel their unscrupulous assaults? Roscoe tells us that Charles was invited into Italy by Sforza, and others of these unscrupulous princes. The Abbé Rohrbacher tells a similar story, and justly speaks of the cardinals, (the *majority* of the college mark,) who went over to Charles, as *traitors*. Most truly are they so described, for if their charge of simony was not false, they must, being the majority, have been implicated in the guilt; so that they were either simonists or slanderers, and in either case, traitors. And yet Dr. Madden, who tells his readers that Charles never would have invaded Italy if it had not

been "for the efforts made by a large number of the cardinals to induce him to remove the unworthy Pontiff from the throne," would have his readers to believe that these hypolitical conspirators were actuated by zeal for the honour of the Church!

In 1494 we find a tumult at Florence, (doubtless with the concurrence of Savonarola,) in which the Medici power is prostrated, and his envy of it satiated; and soon after we find that their magnificent palace was sold by order of the government, (with whom Savonarola was then most influential,) and sacked by the followers of the king of France, his chosen champion, the monarch he selected as the *champion of Christendom!* an unprincipled plunderer, a wicked and depraved man, in comparison of whom the worst Pope who ever reigned was a saint.

Savonarola was now all-powerful in Florence. Let us remark this. Mr. Napier himself, who, like all Protestants, (as well as candid Catholics,) is an admirer of Savonarola, says: "He had gained the name of a prophet," (by foretelling things, as Mr. Napier adds very shrewdly, which he might without any prophetic inspiration have foreseen,) and in the assembly held this same year, 1494, to resettle the government, his influence mainly determined the form of constitution agreed upon. Mr. Napier says most truly, "Like the Calvin of after days, Savonarola bent the public mind to his will by working on their superstition." And though the historian adds, that, unlike Calvin, he was not a "harsh and sanguinary bigot," we shall soon show that in his day of power he became so. After the government was settled under his auspices, and his friend Valori made "Gonfalonier," Mr. Napier tells us that "great discontent was produced by seeing an undue share of office and authority distributed among the followers of Savonarola;" and the chiefs of the Medicean party, whom he had caused to be exiled, of course panted to return. The natural consequence was a conspiracy,—perfectly justifiable,—a conspiracy on the part of exiles to recover their country, whence they had been unjustly expelled, merely from motives of envy and jealousy, and personal malignity. The conspiracy was discovered; their friends in Florence, who were implicated in it, were detected; five of the chiefs were arrested, and Savonarola, and his friend Valori, took a bloody vengeance. Although there

was so utter an absence of anything worthy of death, that the Priors were against their condemnation, Valori, (who was so intimate a friend of Savonarola, that although the latter is not seen in the foreground, the acts of the one were really those of the other,) by the most energetic exertions, by a system of intimidation and excitement, by menaces and by appeals to the mob, pursued the unfortunate victims to the scaffold, and rested not until they were executed. Very truly does Mr. Napier say, "he lived to pay a bloody forfeit for his work." And so did Savonarola, and quite as justly. For the murder of these unhappy men he was as much responsible as Valori, his intimate associate, who by his personal exertions had encompassed the bloody deed; and the one as well as the other were as criminal for it as if they had actually committed it. They did not merely put the law in motion, (cruel as it was, even that would have been criminal,) but they carried their cruelty—remorseless and heartless—beyond the law; they coerced the judges, they menaced them, they compelled them to a sentence of condemnation against their convictions. Who dare say that under such circumstances an execution was not a murder? Then of that morally Savonarola was guilty, and it sat heavy on his soul.

And can it be marvelled at that in this state of things the failure of Savonarola's appeal to the fiery ordeal, should have caused an explosion of public rage, at what was now universally believed to be a detected imposture, and that amidst a tempest of popular fury, Savonarola and Valori should have suffered the death which a few short months before they had cruelly inflicted on five citizens, whose only crime was seeking to restore their exiled friends to home?

Surely these things are not wonderful; but what is wonderful, and something more pitiable, is to find "candid" Catholics imputing these things to the Popedom, and ascribing the death of Savonarola to the vengeance of Alexander, and exalting him as a confessor and martyr. He was as much a martyr as Cæsar, and as much a confessor as Charles. He met the doom of those who use the sword and come to perish by the sword; he had become an intemperate fanatic, a combination of Calvin and Cromwell, all the unbending rigour of the one, and all the remorseless puritanism of the other, a stern and sanguinary zealot. His friend, Charles VIII., died about

the same time. His character no one doubts. And Savonarola always held him up as "*a divine instrument*," (Mr. Napier's words,) "*for the emancipation of Italy from corruption in ecclesiastical government.*" The Eighth Henry of England was just such another as the Eighth Charles of France, and we know what we think of the admirers of our Harry.

And this was the man who, a year or two ago, had declared war against music, and chess, and cards; had got up as a spectacle, a grand combustion of such things in the market-place of Florence; and thus won that reputation for sanctity, by which, in the words of Mr. Napier, like Calvin, he bent the public mind to his will, "by working on their superstition." Why how can it be wondered at that this conduct excited disgust among the educated and enlightened, although for some time the vulgar were, as they always are, the dupes of fanaticism; how can it be marvelled at, that when, as Mr. Napier justly says, "the alleged illegal condemnation of the free citizens who were pitied even by many among the ascendant faction," excited a strong feeling against him; how can it be wondered at that many should thirst to inflict on him the cruel scorn he had inflicted on others; how can it be marvelled at, that now especially as he had been first interdicted from preaching, next summoned to Rome, and then excommunicated for disobedience; how can it be wondered at that there should have arisen against him a deep, we will say a *deserved*, aversion and disgust; so that he was subjected to coarse indignities even while preaching, and visited with insults that showed that on the part of a large portion of the population, he was viewed with execration as a cruel but fallen fanatic?

The republic he cared not for unless he were its ruler. This was perceived, and of course gave his conduct the character of a self-seeking imposture, which revolted even his republican friends. What is far more important to remark, and is slurred over or suppressed by the admirers of Savonarola, is the striking fact that in 1495, two years after his prosecution, and only a single year after his rising to the highest influence in Florence, owing to the expulsion of the Medici, and the re-establishment of his favourite form of government, the whole of sixteen Dominican Masters in Theology (save one), the theologians of his own order, condemned Savonarola's preaching. It

must have been very unsound or very secular: and it was at this time, we are informed by Dr. Madden, that his language began to assume a more determined character of opposition to the Pope, Alexander VI. Why at "this time?" Plainly because those who were faithful to the Holy See, even the theologians of his own order, complained of and condemned his preaching, and, with the infallible instinct of incipient schism, he conceived apprehensions of the Holy See, although it had not yet spoken against him, and he contrived to seek to prejudice its voice when it did speak, by blackening its character and defaming its motives. Not until the middle of the year 1495 came the first citation from the Pope, couched, as Dr. Madden admits, in no unkindly terms,—indeed, as he adds, "*the probability is that at that time no unfriendly feelings were entertained by the Pope towards the friar.*" He utterly disregarded it. The end of the year saw him suspended from preaching. But the beginning of the next year saw his suspension removed *at the instigation of the magistracy of the city.* So that at this time his influence with the government was not gone. We pray our readers to remark this,—it will be found most important. He resumed preaching in 1496. At the end of that year came the second citation and suspension, and then an excommunication, which, however, was not for a year after published, on account of his influence with the government; for so late as July we find the Signoria remonstrating against it. At the carnival of that year so powerful had been his influence that the celebrated *auto-da-fe* of the societies of Florence, took place under his auspices amidst a fervour of enthusiasm almost amounting to frenzy. And not until the next year was his excommunication published. Now, mark. In August 1497 occurred the execrable murder of the five distinguished citizens of Florence, who were detected in an attempt to restore the Medici, so unjustly and ungratefully exiled. We have seen what the influence of Savonarola was with the rulers and people of Florence at that period. The most prominent actor in the murder of the so-called conspirators was Francesco de Vallori, the intimate ally of Savonarola, and he most unquestionably sanctioned and assented to, and never disapproved of or opposed the slaughter of the victims, whose friends threw themselves at the feet of the friar and his ally, imploring

mercy, but in vain. Yet Dr. Madden is so mistaken as to say, "at that time the power and influence of Savonarola in the government was gone, and he had no act or part in the proceedings." Our readers will now perceive why we have been so careful as to *dates*. There is irresistible force in truth, and one of its chief tests is the order of time.

Let us look at some of the details of this transaction as narrated by one on whom—albeit a Protestant, and a bitter foe of the Papacy—and thoroughly imbued with all the vulgar traditions as to the atrocity of Alexander—far more reliance can be placed than on Dr. Madden,—we mean Mr. Napier. That able writer, although an admirer of Savonarola, does not attempt to conceal, as does Dr. Madden, the friar's participation, by at least tacit consent, and implied acquiescence in the butchery of the five gentlemen who were executed for seeking to bring back the Medici. Be it recollected that Piero de Medici was attached to Alexander, and that his house had for years been the object of the animosity of Savonarola. The enmity of the latter to Piero and the Pope has a close connection of both feelings with his own passion for political power. The Seigniorie were against the execution of a capital sentence on the unfortunate friends of Piero. Whose stern influence overawed them to a more sanguinary course? That of Francesco Vallori, the bosom friend—the intimate ally—of Savonarola. The foes of the Medici were the friends of Savonarola; the allies of Savonarola were the enemies of the Medici. Mr. Napier points out,* that when a law which had been enacted under the influence of Savonarola, stood in the way of the condemnation of the five accused, Francesco Vallori managed to get it set aside, with gross and shameless injustice in this particular instance; and he adds, with evident truth, leaning to Savonarola, "There was a loud and apparently an unjust outcry against Savonarola and his party," (we crave attention to these words,) "for allowing their own law to be infringed when it was likely to work in an enemies' favour."

Mr. Napier is so much an admirer of Savonarola, that he goes on to argue that this outcry was unjust, and that

* Hist. Florence, vol. iii. c. 7.

the law was justly altered to secure the condemnation of the accused, (a strange doctrine to British ears, and certainly one which would revolt a British lawyer, or a Catholic theologian); but that is not the point we are discussing, which is simply this, whether Savonarola was not *concerned* in the sanguinary transaction; and we have cited one of the most distinguished of our own historians of the time, and one very partial to Savonarola, to prove that he *was*. The remarkable expression he uses, as applied to the promoters of the prosecution, "*Savonarola and his party*," sufficiently shows this, and also shows that Savonarola had a political party, which is what his opponents always complained of, and that for which, in reality, he met his unfortunate fate. The simple fact that Valori, the man to whom, as Mr. Napier clearly shows, the condemnation of the accused to death was entirely owing, was the intimate friend of Savonarola, affords ample evidence of the fact stated by Mr. Napier, and for which we have cited his authority, that Savonarola and his party were the promoters of a sanguinary proceeding, deemed unnecessary by the majority of the magistracy of Florence, and only assented to under absolute terror of the influence of "*Savonarola and his party*." In the face of all this Dr. Madden assures his readers that Savonarola had no concern with the transaction, that his influence was gone. Why Mr. Napier tells us that although excommunicated in June of this year, (the transaction taking place in August,) "this adherent disregarded it," and incited and urged by the government, he recommenced preaching in February 1498.

The pains taken by his admirers to deny and disguise their hero's participation in the affair, sufficiently show their own sense of its atrocity, while, on the other hand, their misrepresentations as to the influence of the rebellious friar even down to the commencement of 1498, after he had been thrice cited, and twice suspended, by the Holy See, after his sentence of excommunication had been passed upwards of a year, and even he had been publicly excommunicated for months—all this clearly exposes the falsity of Dr. Madden's representations, that the death of Savonarola was a crime chargeable on Alexander. The plain facts show that the magistracy and the people of Florence treated with contempt the spiritual weapons by which alone Alexander pursued the contumacious friar,

and that his death must be ascribed to other and purely local causes. That the Pope properly excommunicated him, and that his conduct was utterly indefensible, rebellious, and schismatical, is clearly shown in the article on Savonarola, written by one who is as sincere an admirer of the really brilliant qualities of the ill-fated Dominican as Dr. Madden himself, in the Review for October.

Mr. Napier shows, what hardly requires to be shown, that during the ten months which elapsed between the murder of the friends of the Medici by Savonarola and his party, in August 1497, to the execution of the friar and his friends in April, in the very next year, causes powerful enough were at work to procure the downfall of the sanguinary zealot. Had the friends of the murdered men no feelings of revenge? Did their blood not call for vengeance? And on whom should that vengeance fall but on Valori and Savonarola? Mr. Napier tells us that notwithstanding the seigniory were in favour of Savonarola in 1497, in that very year there was such a feeling against him among the numerous friends of the Medici, that he was openly insulted in the pulpit. Let all those who, like Dr. Madden, are fond of railing against Alexander as the cause of the death of Savonarola, mark this significant sentence of Mr. Napier's. "The gonfalonier and members of the seigniory for March and April, (1498) were enemies to Savonarola, and numbers of noble citizens still burned with indignation for the sacrifice of last year's victims, so that they moved heaven and earth to inflame the discontent against him; their hour of triumph was now come, and success was certain."

In the face of facts like these, facts palpable and flagrant, narrated by an able Protestant historian, is it not too bad for a Catholic writer to insist in casting on the Pontiffs the odium of the death of Savonarola, which was plainly the result of a reaction from his own political supremacy, and the revenge of the cruelty perpetrated by himself and his party? But this is not all that Mr. Napier tells. He says, "Both parties began to arm." "The adherents of Savonarola proposed to arm, especially Valori." In this state of the public mind occurs the miserable tragedy of the trial by fire, which kindled a flame of popular fury, under cover of which the friends of the Medici slew Savonarola, having first slain Valori. The circumstance is significant, for Savonarola and

Valori, as we have seen, had been the chief, the sole cause of the slaughter of the five citizens who sought the return of the Medici.

It matters not that ecclesiastical agencies were employed to compass the condemnation of the contumacious friar; that was in a certain sense essential, as he was a priest, and the object was his execution. The events of the preceding twelve months show that excommunication did not necessarily injure a man much in Florence so long as he was a favourite of the rulers and the people, and that they cared not a straw for citations or censures of the Holy See while Savonarola answered their ends or retained their favour; but the moment the re-action commenced against him, promoted by private revenge and political faction, and the explosion of popular fury at the failure of his last imposture, laid him at the mercy of his personal and political enemies, the ecclesiastical means were eagerly resorted to for his condemnation and execution, and "enlightened" Protestants and "candid" Catholics concur in casting on the Church all the odium of the transaction, and reviling the Holy See for the death of Savonarola, which was, whether merited or unmerited in an ecclesiastical or legal point of view, at all events a remarkable moral retribution, the manifest consummation of a career of turbulent agitation and an impressive commentary on the words of our Lord, that "they who use the sword must *perish* by the sword." This is the true story of Savonarola, and rightly considered it has nothing to do with the character of the Pontiff and throws no odium on Alexander. That Savonarola in a certain sense deserved his doom—that is, that he was a rebel in the Church and in the State—we think must plainly appear to the readers of the article in the *Review* of October, though that his shocking fate should provoke profound pity and regret no mind sensitive to the sorrows and errors of a noble nature will be induced to deny. In his sad fate we see fruits of that pride which is the last infirmity of noble minds, and weep over the ruin of a noble soul. But let us not permit ourselves in our pity for him to do injustice to others; above all, let us beware how we assail a Pontiff with unmerited revilings and cover calumny under the mask of charity.

It is to us a matter of painful *scandal* to see how easily, how eagerly, "candid" Catholics receive the most shocking charges against popes and prelates, unsupported

by any valid evidence whatever: we repeat, unsupported by any valid evidence at all. Except in the instance of some false and schismatic popes foisted on the faithful by rulers and princes, we know of no instance in which wicked conduct is brought home to a Pope by specific statements of writers of credit vouching the authority of witnesses of credit speaking to their own knowledge. Ought Catholics to receive and circulate scandalous charges against successors of St. Peter on any evidence less credible? Ought one who has held the Apostle's keys to be surrendered to obloquy and infamy in the absence of evidence as valid as could satisfy us on the character of a butler? The most serious statements affecting their character are often written without the pretence of authority, and are copied without hesitation or reflection, although written by violent partisans. For instance, some of the worst things as to Alexander in reference to Savonarola are written by Burlamacchi, a convert of Savonarola's and an enthusiastic admirer of him. And one of his statements, on what authority (says Dr. Madden) he does not mention, is, that the Cardinal of Sienna, afterwards Pope Pius III., wrote a letter from Rome to the father offering his good offices with the Pope (which is probably true enough) on condition of payment of a large sum of money. Now does any one believe this? Does Dr. Madden? Then why did he republish it? Is it necessary to show that it is a falsehood? Is it not on the face of it a falsehood? Is it not impossible that any prelate of the court of Rome should so commit himself to a man like Savonarola as to write such a letter? The truth no doubt is, that there was a letter written, kind and charitable, which the proud and obstinate friar rejected. Does any man believe that if Savonarola had received such a letter he would not have mentioned it publicly? It would have been a weapon against the Pope whom he had so furiously denounced infinitely more formidable than any he could lay hands upon. Yet not a word of it is heard, save from the lips of Burlamacchi, who takes care to assure his readers that he wrote concerning Savonarola the things he had seen with his eyes, or heard from his lips, or heard from other persons of veracity, or read in official documents. Had he seen or read this letter? Does any one believe that he had? If he had, can it be doubted he would have said so? Would any disciple of Savonarola have suppressed it had

he ever seen such a letter? The result of these enquiries surely must be—either a conviction that Savonarola, from whom alone directly or indirectly the statement could have come, was not a "person of veracity," or at least a deep impression of the worthlessness of hearsay and *ex parte* statements by partizan writers. Let it be observed that all the contemporary writers relied on for the statements favourable to Savonarola and hostile to Alexander were partizans or friends of Savonarola, Burlamacchi, Nardi, Mirandola. Let us look at a specimen of the way in which those men wrote—Burlamacchi tells us "that a chaplain of Monsieur Pandolf's, who lodged with one of the commissaries of the Pope in Florence, related" (to whom?) "that the night before the death of Savonarola several citizens carried large sums of money to the commissary, and among the rest one person carried to him 1,000 ducats," (for what?) "with which money he" (who?) "returned to Rome as it was reported," (by whom? to whom?) "and bought a cardinal's hat." It was reported, however, says Burlamacchi, that he became ultimately repentant, but others of Savonarola's admirers say he died a very miserable death, obviously implying impenitence, and none of them giving any idea what the poor man had to be particularly penitent for. We may say of these men as the Gospel historians say of our Lord's accusers—"neither did their testimony agree together." Did any one ever see such slipshod, such shuffling, such utterly disgraceful testimony, on which to brand and blacken the characters of popes and prelates? The object of this precious concoction is palpable; it is to produce an impression that Alexander was party to the death of Savonarola, and for that purpose (we grieve to say) gravely quoted by Dr. Madden, who surely could scarcely put reliance upon it! It is impossible to imagine a statement less worthy of respect. It is positively contemptible. It is rendered all the more contemptible from the very fact that the mention of the "Pope's commissary" (one of whose functions was to receive the contributions to the Papal revenues in any cities where they resided), suggests the idea that there may have been, as there is in most instances of falsehood, some shadow of foundation for part of the statement, viz. that money was brought to the Papal commissary not only the night before the death of Savonarola, but on many other nights. And that is absolutely

the only fact that is distinctly to be collected from the statement as clearly averred even on hearsay, or rather report of hearsay. For this Burlamacchi, who assures us that he records nothing which he had not seen or heard from persons of veracity, does not say that on this or any other occasion it was not hearsay which he heard; and on this occasion all he says, even as to the sole fact distinctly reported, is—that some one had related to some one—who it was he says not, and it may have come to himself through six persons, distorted at each step of its progress. And as to the next, which is all mere matter of insinuation or suggestion, that one person, who "brought money," (it is not said for what purpose, and it may have been quite lawful) "as it was reported, went to Rome and bought a cardinal's hat." It is consistent with what is said by Burlamacchi, that he merely heard from some one that there was such a report; and what is hearsay evidence of a report worth, the hearsay and the report alike emanating from heated partisans? Such are the sort of statements on which "candid" Catholics blacken the characters of pontiffs.

With such Catholics as these, any writer who testifies against a Pope is cordially credited; but any statement, even of the very same writer, in favour of papacy is rejected. When Machiavelli testifies against a Borgia he is quoted with eagerness; when he speaks against Savonarola he is disregarded. When Audin praises Leo X. for having prevented the part of Savonarola being played over again in the pulpit of Florence, by a friar who seemed desirous to emulate him, and issued a brief against pretended prophecies, Dr. Madden indignantly draws attention to the fact that Leo was a son of Lorenzo de Medici, and a brother of Piero, whose downfall was attributed by the Medici to Savonarola; and when Burlamacchi is quoted as narrating how Julius II. declared himself favourably of Savonarola, we are not reminded that Julius, when cardinal, had been opposed to Alexander and endeavoured to oppose him. When Bayle says anything against a Pope, he is carefully copied as a writer of credit by the candid Catholic; but when he exposes the impostures of Savonarola, he is stigmatized as a sceptic. Is not this something more than literary unfairness? Is it not simply scandalous? Should the characters of pontiffs be dealt with in a spirit so studiously unfair and

systematically unjust? All the shocking statements of Muratori or Guicciardini as to the conduct of the Borgias are recorded with minuteness, with no care to dissect their testimonies or discover their inconsistencies, while the refutations supplied by the learned and impartial researches of Roscoe are summarily and disrespectfully discarded. Is this creditable to a Catholic writer? Could he be ignorant of the influences under which the Italian historians wrote? Could he be unaware that they were under the patronage and often in the pay of the princes, those plunderers of the Church, against whose spoliations it was the fate of the Borgias to struggle? As we have seen, the Colonnas and the Orsini were in league with the enemies of the Holy See, striving to dispossess her of her patrimony, they were described as the victims of the Borgias. And then to envenom the accusations against him, these children are described as monsters of depravity, as incarnations of unutterable wickedness; while he is painted as the instigator of their iniquity and the accomplice of their crimes. Now in dealing with such a system of accusation, if some of its chief parts are proved slanderous the whole may fairly be presumed a fabrication of falsehood, as all rests on the same testimony. And in effecting this demolition there can be no difficulty. As respects Cæsar Borgia, his vindication rests on the same foundation as that which supports the character of the Popes for several centuries against similar accusations. They were assailed by unscrupulous enemies, and they defended themselves. Alexander was encompassed, like the rest, by malignant enemies, and Cæsar was his general. Let us read one chapter in his history—one of the darkest—as told by a bitter foe of the Papacy, the unprincipled Machiavelli. "A relation of the murder of Vitellozzi, Vitelli, Oliveretto, Cardinal Capalo, and the Duke de Gravina, committed by Cæsar Borgia, commonly called the Duke Valentino." "The Duke had resolved upon an expedition against Bologna, of which the Vitelli, the Orsini, and their followers being apprised, they agreed that the Duke had usurped too great power" (that is in their opinion, his rivals and foes) "and that upon capturing Bologna, it might be concluded that his intention was to put them to death;" whereupon they held a diet "and held it expedient to curtail him in time," that is to say, to cut him off; for in those days that was the real result of

such resolves as those. The logic of these sanguinary gentlemen was characteristic of tyrants and bandits as they were. They wanted an excuse for attacking Borgia, to cover the real motives—rapacity and jealousy. The excuse they devised was that he would be disposed to destroy them: that is, they wanted to kill him, and they chose to suppose that he wanted to kill them. He discovered their designs, and to prevent his own destruction had to destroy them. And this Machiavelli calls a murder, because it was committed by Borgia; and what would he have said had it been by the Medicis?

It was against the Colonna, the Savelli, and the Orsini that Cæsar Borgia waged his war, feudatories of the Church (as Audin justly terms them) who fattened on her spoils and proved themselves serpents ever ready to assail her. It was only to recover the patrimony of the Holy See that Cæsar fought, who having discovered that he had a better vocation to defend the Church by arms than by devotion, had become her soldier, and in a lawful war acted, as the Abbé Corry in his life of Alexander says "*selon les règles de la guerre*," an expression which Dr. Madden quotes with reprobation, without touching on the main question whether the war were lawful, which of course the Abbe assumes or shows, but the negative of which Dr. Madden assumes and does *not* show, namely, that it was unlawful. Does he mean to say that it was unlawful to recover the territories of the Church by force of arms from her felon feudatories? or that if it were lawful or not, it was unlawful to proceed according to the rules of war? Is it not monstrous to cast all the odium of the exigencies or incidents of a struggle for life and death between the defenders of the Holy See and its spoliators on the defenders, and represent them as the assailants and the spoliators as the victims and sufferers? And is it decent in a Catholic writer, carefully suppressing all the atrocities of these plunderers of the Church, to narrate (in the language of writers who were in their pay) all the acts of hostility against them as acts of unmitigated and inexcusable atrocity? Is this the way candid Catholics should write history, when it touches the character of those who have worn the purple or held St. Peter's keys? Truly of such it may be said, "you are the descendants of those who killed the prophets: for they slew them and ye dig their

graves." The Colonnas plundered the Church, and the candid Catholics enshrine them.

The chief charge against Cæsar Borgia is that of the murder of his brother, the Duke of Gandia, a charge which has all the most atrocious characteristics of calumny, in that it is made not only in the absence of any atom of evidence to excuse it, but is supported by surmises the most malignant that ever were invented by the human mind. The remarks of the Protestant Roscoe on this subject are so sensible as should put to shame many candid Catholics who, in their insane eagerness to cast odium on the families of any they have been accustomed to abuse as "bad popes," have swallowed with blind credulity the irrational and diabolical hypotheses on which the cruel calumniators of the Borgias have sought to sustain their monstrous charge by others still more monstrous:—"The perpetration of this crime has been imputed by the Italian historians without hesitation to Cæsar, who being disgusted with his ecclesiastical profession and desirous of signalizing himself in a military capacity, is supposed to have been jealous of the Duke. It might, (says Roscoe,) be observed that the destination of the elder brother to a secular employment did not necessarily confine the younger to an ecclesiastical state, and that the honour bestowed on the Duke did not prevent the Pontiff from promoting the interests of his second son, whom he had placed in such a station as to afford him an opportunity of obtaining the highest dignity in Christendom. Some authors, therefore, (continues the historian) have not scrupled to suggest a more powerful cause of the supposed enmity." Let the reader remark the *therefore*; that is to say, because they were resolved to make a malignant charge for which there was no evidence, and had to suggest a motive to give the least plausibility to the charge, and the one they first suggested was too absurd to bear a moment's examination—therefore, they did not scruple (ah no! no scruple influences those cruel calumniators) to suggest a more powerful cause of the supposed enmity: what that was we need not enter into more particularly; enough to say that it relates to Lucretia, and has amply been disposed of by Roscoe himself.

"Frequently, however, as this charge has been repeated, and indiscriminately as it has been believed, it might not be difficult to show that so far from this being with justice

admitted as a proof that Cæsar Borgia was the perpetrator of the murder of his brother, the imputation is in itself in the highest degree improbable, and the transaction must therefore be judged by such positive evidence as yet remains, without presuming the guilt of Borgia from circumstances which are yet more questionable than the crime of which he stands accused." Roscoe takes the most particular account of the transaction as given by Burchardt, (the account which is quoted by Dr. Madden), and what does it amount to? In effect to this, that for a month before the fatal night an unknown person in a mask had visited him daily; that after supping with his mother, in company with Cæsar his brother, they proceeded from her house together for some distance, when the Duke parted from the Cardinal, (informing him that he had to pay a visit,) and dismissing all his servants but the masked person and a footman, went away. At a certain spot he left his servant, and proceeded alone with the masked person, being the last time he was seen alive, save by his murderers. Within a short time he must have been murdered, and it must have been in the company of the masked person, who does not appear ever to have been discovered. Now, such being the facts, and remembering moreover the dreadful state of Rome during the pontificates of Sixtus and Alexander, owing to the turbulent conduct of the nobility, who, in the absence of the Popes from Rome, had become lawless and reckless in the last degree; recollecting also that the Borgias had bitter enemies, and enemies well capable of the crime of assassination, a crime so common in Rome that upwards of two hundred instances of it occurred in a short period of that era; remembering these circumstances, one should have thought that the most obvious and probable supposition would have been adopted—that an enemy had done this. But alas! no, there is malignity more fell than that of the murderer, and this malignity prompted some of those who hated the family to strive to inflict upon it a deadlier wound than the assassin's, and brand it with the awful guilt of fratricide. Nothing but the most malignant enmity could have devised so fiend-like an accusation—for all the facts absolutely, utterly negative it, and make it palpably false, flagrantly impossible. The Duke parts from the Cardinal and proceeds in a different direction with his own servant: parts from him, and proceeds alone with a mysterious and

masked stranger, as to whom nothing is known. Throughout the whole narrative, says the intelligent historian, there is not the slightest indication that Cæsar had any share in the transaction, and the continuance of the favour of his father and mother after the event may prove to every impartial mind that he was not even suspected by them as the author of the crime." Such is the calm, deliberate judgment of an eminently calm and dispassionate mind—the mind of a Protestant—as to this, the chief charge against Cæsar Borgia: a charge indeed comprising a combination of charges of the most horrible, diabolical and unnatural criminality. The learned Roscoe is of opinion that these accusations against the Borgias are false; and confessedly there is not the shadow of actual evidence, however remote or circumstantial, against them. All rests on bare surmise, without an excuse even for suspicion, the mere invention of a murderous hate. Strange that calumnies discredited by Protestant historians should be greedily received by Catholics, and that the children of the Papacy should gather up to assail it with accusations which its opponents despise!

The other of the accusations against Cæsar, and indirectly against Alexander, who is represented as sanctioning the crimes of his son, is the execution of the conspirators of Sinigaglia—men who had combined to destroy him. This we have already disposed of.

A more striking instance is that of Alexander's daughter, Lucretia. Every one knows the horrible accusations by which she has been assailed, and we hope every one knows how admirably she has been vindicated by the learned labours of Roscoe. "The historians of Ferrara mention her with the highest praise. Her marriage with Alfonso of Este was celebrated in a Latin epithalamium by Ariosto; and if the moral character of the bride had been so notoriously disgraceful as to render her an object of abhorrence, it is scarcely to be supposed that Ariosto would have had the effrontery or the absurdity to represent her as rivalling in the decorum of her manners as well as in the beauty of her person all that former times could boast." In the forty-second book of his immortal poem he has raised a temple of female excellence, the splendid niches of which are occupied by women of the greatest merit and chief distinction in Italy, and among them Lucretia Borgia assumes the first and most conspicuous station. The

celebrated printer, Aldo Manuzio, tells her that her chief desire is to stand approved by God and to be useful not only to the present age but to future times, so that when you quit this life you may leave behind you a monument that you have not lived in vain, and he commends in the warmest terms her piety, her liberality, and her justice. Now as the assailants of Alexander associate his iniquity especially with that of his daughter, her vindication is in a great measure his own: the more so if we consider that she was undoubtedly the object of his most anxious affection, (which he evinced in the most truly paternal way in carefully attending to her happiness in her matrimonial unions), and the fair and ordinary presumption is, that a daughter undoubtedly sometimes owed in some degree her virtue to his care. Thus then the demoniacal malice of his slanderers recoils upon themselves and helps to refute their diabolical accusations. That affection for her, which with fiend-like malignity they distort into a crime, is by her admirable character, as testified by the noblest writers of the age, converted into his most victorious vindication.

On what perilous ground a Catholic author is when he ventures rashly to assail the character of a Pontiff, one or two passages from the concluding portions of Dr. Madden's work will sadly illustrate. "It is the fact (he says) that Alexander committed no act against the faith, and promulgated no decree in contravention of doctrines duly sanctioned by the Church in its councils." These last words seem to imply an unconsciousness that the decrees of Popes, *ex cathedra*, declare doctrines "duly sanctioned by the Church," whether or not sanctioned by any of its councils. In the next page, however, he says: "If Alexander never promulgated any doctrine as an article of faith that was not orthodox, it cannot be said that he never issued any bull, ordinance, or rescript whose decisions were at variance with the eternal principles of justice, truth, and morality." The writer evidently thinks that Popes—even Popes who decree nothing contrary to the faith—may nevertheless issue decrees or briefs "at variance with justice, truth, and morality." There is a more than questionable character in this: and the passage reveals a confusion of ideas which renders it obscure: nor is the obscurity diminished by the gross inconsistency of the very next sentence with that which went before. "The whole pontifical career" (i.e. his acts as Pontiff, or at least while

Pontiff) "of Alexander was one unbroken succession of outrages against all those principles. It was in practice a downright disregard of Christianity: a mad, reckless infidelity: an atheism manifested not in words but acts, supervening on unbridled lust, rapacity, and ambition." There is an incoherent extravagance in this shocking sentence which makes it difficult to dissect it. But if it have any meaning it means this—that a Pontiff who does not act against the faith may act all through the whole of his pontifical career with downright disregard of Christianity. The "whole of his pontifical career" must at least, and one should suppose peculiarly if not exclusively, include his acts as Pontiff; and how a Pontiff who never committed any act against the faith could always act with disregard of Christianity is hard to understand.

It is obvious that this is reckless raving. We will show that it is so out of the writer's own words in the next page. He is obliged to admit what we have all along been arguing,—“That the political enmity of so many adversaries has caused his crimes against one virtue in particular, (he evidently means the virtue of chastity), from the time of his elevation to the pontificate, to be exaggerated.” He adds,—and let the reader mark—“There is no conclusive evidence to be found in the history of his times, of his having flagrantly violated his vows of chastity during the period of his pontificate.” Passing over the peculiar sophistry which seems to insinuate that a Pontiff may violate his vows of chastity without flagrantly violating them; and the unfairness of suggesting that there is any evidence of Alexander's having done so flagrantly or not during the period of his pontificate, when it must be known to Dr. Madden there is none at all—passing this by, the admission of Dr. Madden is enough to convict him of great rashness in so recklessly charging Alexander VI., the Pope, with “unbridled lust,”—when on his own confession there is no conclusive evidence of his having ever once violated his vows of chastity after he ascended the apostolical throne. We go farther, and we say that, seeing that the assailants of Alexander make his lust while Pope one of their chief charges, and on the confession of one of his most determined assailants, that it is a foul calumny; this should have suggested to the mind of any Catholic writer a charitable suspicion that the other accusations against this much maligned pontiff were

equally false, and prevented a wholesale and reckless repetition of them in language the most inflamed and most envenomed. But this is not all; no, nor nearly all. What will the reader say when he is assured that the admission which Dr. Madden so reluctantly makes as to the chastity of Alexander during his pontificate, might and ought equally to be made as to his prelacy and cardinalate? It is so. For there is not an atom of credible evidence that Alexander, after entering the Church, carried on any impure connection; and there are strong reasons to suppose the reverse. One reason is, that it would have been almost impossible for a person of such distinction, and with such remorseless foes, to have carried on a criminal intercourse without facts transpiring which would have been trumpeted forth with triumph instead of vague, general abuse. Another, and a stronger reason is this, that, whereas the chief charge against him is his care for his natural children, (a queer kind of charge,—for surely if it were a crime to have them, it were a virtue to take care of them,) and yet we never heard of any younger than Cæsar and Lucretia; and there is, as Dr. Madden admits, great doubt whether they were sister and brother, which, of itself raises a fair question whether there were not truth in the representation of Alexander that Cæsar was not his son at all, but the legitimate son of the widow with whom in early life he had lived. Anyhow, if he had ever since their birth been living in a criminal state, it is not easily accountable that no children are heard of at all after that time than they, and they were born when he was not a priest at all, but a soldier; and a soldier, in an age certainly as corrupt as any that had passed away. All the coarse calumnies about the unbridled lust of Alexander, therefore, come to this, that some twenty years before he was Pope—before he was a priest—while he was a gay and gallant soldier, he had lived in sin. Why the same might probably be said of St. Ignatius, and probably would have been said had he been Pope in the age of Alexander. Really and truly, when the evidence is looked to, this is all that it comes to. There are heaps of obscene assertions by writers in the interest of his foes, but of credible evidence there is none to any greater extent than what we have stated.

In addition to the discredit thrown upon all the accusations of Alexander by the established falsehood of the

worst charges against him and others of his family, there is a powerful argument in his favour derivable from the flagrant inconsistency of these accusations with the tenor and character of his private life, as described even by his enemies. "Even by his severest adversaries," says Roscoe, "he is allowed to have been a man of an elevated genius and wonderful memory;" qualities not very commonly found united with brutal debauchery and horrible lust; but mark what follows: "In his diet he was peculiarly temperate, and he accustomed himself to but little sleep." We appeal to every observer of human nature whether these are the characteristics of a mind and body enervated by impurity or degraded by debauchery. Dr. Madden indeed admits that during his papacy Alexander did not flagrantly (which we presume means not at all), violate his vows of chastity, but the point to be observed is, that all those historians who malign his memory and revile his name, declare that he did; and that he lived a life not only of lust, but of lust abominable and horrible. Now, if writers most hostile to him, not only writers so impartial as Voltaire, Bayle, or Roscoe, pronounce these accusations to be horrid calumnies; and if authors so avowedly hostile as Dr. Madden, declare them to be false, and to be unsupported by any evidence, what are we to think of the fiend-like malignity of the writers whose foul minds invented and fabricated these fictions of crime; and how can we hesitate to discard as unworthy of credit all the other accusations resting on such infamous testimony? This is the course taken in courts of justice when witnesses are convicted of wicked falsehood. It is the just and fair course, and if not taken in respect to the bad Popes, it is only because the wish to make them bad, is first father to the thought, and then the will clings to the thought too tenaciously to yield to any touch of charity or force of truth. It is a collateral but not immaterial confirmation of our opinion as to the real character of Alexander, that he should have been selected by the kings of Spain and Portugal as the arbiter of their disputes, respecting the boundary of their newly discovered territories in America, especially, as Gosselin informs us, that the selection of Alexander VI. by the two sovereigns as umpire of their disputes, was founded principally on the respect which both professed for the sacred character of the Pope, so that as he expressly states in his Bull upon the question that his

arbitration was at their voluntary selection,—it is clear that in his person the Apostolical authority had sustained no injury. Could this be consistent with political depravity? Where could we find clearer evidence of calumny?

Take the death of Alexander as narrated by Guicciardini. Nothing can be compared to it for malignity and mendacity except part of Shakspeare's account of the death of Cardinal Beaufort. The Pope is represented as having been poisoned with a fatal draught, prepared by his son Cæsar, for a common enemy. Now, as the murder is said to have occurred at the house of that enemy, or alleged enemy, it might have suggested itself to any unprejudiced person that possibly the enemy had administered the poison: and candid Catholics always carefully keep out of view the fact that the foes of the Popes used poison and poniards. But passing these points over it is perfectly plain that the Pope did not die of poison at all, and that the whole of the elaborate account of the Italian historian is emphatically and literally *a lie*. Burchardt, the papal master of the ceremonies, in his diary, gives a detailed narrative of the illness of Alexander, which terminated in his death—there not being a word as to poison. Voltaire says most truly, and surely a more impartial or acute authority could not be quoted: "Europe is deceived by Guicciardini, as he was by his passion; he hated the Pope, and by his hate judged the Pope's actions; there is not a vestige of proof of this accusation against his memory." Rohrbacher writes in similar terms. And even Dr. Madden is compelled to say: "no sufficient evidence of the fact stated by Guicciardini has ever been adduced." We might ask how Dr. Madden reconciled it with his conscience as a Catholic, to give renewed currency to such an atrocious fabrication, with this faint and hesitating intimation of doubt. Let that pass. Clearly the whole narrative of Guicciardini is an elaborate lie. The important question surely suggests itself; how can we rely on other similar statements of such a mendacious historian? Strange to say, it does not occur to Dr. Madden, to ask a single question, still less to answer it; but he unscrupulously cites all the atrocious statements of this lying writer, so far as they assail the character of Alexander.

It was all very well for these writers to revile a Pontiff who sought to add to the dominions of the Holy See by

arms, instead of affording the example of a well-regulated life. No doubt the princes who patronized them, the plunderers of the Church would prefer Pontiffs of a more peaceful and ascetic character, who submitted patiently to have the possessions of the Holy See torn from them, and surrendered to ruthless wretches who thought nothing of cutting off men's hands and feet, or burning or flaying those who offended them. But there is, as Scripture says, a time for all things, even for fighting, and when a prince, (for the pope is prince as well as a pontiff,) finds his subjects tortured and plundered by ruthless usurpers, surely fighting may be a duty. That it was a duty undertaken by Pontiffs not always from warlike propensities, but from a sense of justice, is evident from the instance of the successor of Julius, the peaceful and humane Leo de Medici, who, before his own elevation to the Popedom, went into the field with the Papal army, and was indefatigable in exhorting them to contend with courage for the perfection of the Holy See, and the liberties of Italy. And Roscoe describes the objects which these Pontiffs had in view, and which Ranke justly calls "magnanimous," as being to recover the possessions of the Holy See, and to restore Italy to the dominion of its native princes. The fact is, Italy had become the prey of spoilers, and for the patrimony of the Holy See the wild boar had devoured it; remedy for so disordered a state of things could not be but sharp; the boar could only be driven out by the sword; the lamb could not be rescued only by the shepherd's crook. A race of spoliators and oppressors, of felon chieftains and bandit barons, could not be extirpated by sermons; it was a time for sterner measures; and it is namby-pamby philosophy, and mawkish theology, which affects to be scandalized at a Pontiff and a prince resisting with the sword those who seek to slay with the sword, defending his own subjects from cruel tyranny, and repulsing those who sacrilegiously preyed upon the patrimony of the Church, and oppressed it with brutal barbarism, and deluged it in blood!

A clear light is thrown upon the real cause and character of the accusations against Alexander, by the nature of those which are levelled at his successor, Julius II. Of him Roscoe truly says, that in suppressing the vicars of the Church, and uniting their territories to the Holy See—a curious instance this of the destroying influence of

prejudice, even on a superior mind, for the very term vicars, implies that they were delegates of the Papacy, and that their territories were not theirs, but those of the Church—"he completed what Alexander had begun," or rather which Sixtus had begun and Alexander continued. "The Italian historians, however, have not shown themselves favourable to his fame, and Guicciardini asserts, that if he be considered as a great man, it is only by those who have forgotten the right meaning of words, and conceive it rather the office of a Pontiff to add to the dominion of the apostolic see by Christian arms and Christian blood, than to afford the example of a well-regulated life;" an observation breathing the spirit of hypocrisy, which characterizes the secular historians of the age in speaking of the Papacy, and which may be compared with a similar observation of Villani, made with reference to these very "vicars" of the Holy See when originally established. Muratori goes further than Guicciardini in malignity of calumny, for he charges Julius with meditating the murder of the Duke d'Este, an accusation which the discriminating Roscoe discards as utterly groundless. The fact is, it will marvellously aid us in estimating at their true value these accusations, to consider who were the authors. Thus Guicciardini was a Florentine, citizen of a state often at enmity with the Holy See, by reason of its own restless aggressiveness. And Muratori was a partizan of the House of Este. Suffice it on this subject to say here, that it is plain to any impartial mind—as illustrated alike in the instances of Sixtus, Alexander, and Julius—that Popes who defended the temporal possessions of the Holy See, were exposed to the malignant enmity of the princes who seized them, and the calumnies of the writers they patronized.

The manner in which even historians so enlightened as Roscoe speak of Pontiffs so eminent as Leo X., especially on the subject of their temporal possessions of the Holy See, very much illustrates our views with respect to those whom we have referred to as the so-called bad Popes. We have seen that these Pontiffs became objects of hostility and calumny chiefly on account of their ability in resisting aggressions on the Church, and their efforts to restore her patrimony. Leo X. has never been classed even by enemies of the Papacy with those whose names are blackened as the "bad Popes," but still he is considered by

candid Catholics and enlightened Protestants as by no means coming up to their exalted ideal of perfection, because he was not sufficiently ascetic, and was worldly-minded enough to lose no opportunity of recovering any part of the Papal territories. It was for this that Sixtus, Alexander, and Julius, were reviled, and for this Leo did not escape calumny. In his time, however, the Church was beginning to reap the fruit of the labours of former Pontiffs, and on the impartial authority of Roscoe we can affirm that Italy was rendered more tranquil by the extension of the power of the Church, and the recovery of her patrimony. How could it be otherwise, when we contrast the peace and prosperity of the states under the benign sway of the Holy See, with the painful condition of those who groaned under the brutal domination of those bandits, the Italian barons? When speaking of the endeavours of Leo to recover the territory of Perugia, Roscoe writes in these terms :—

"For some years he had turned his attention towards the smaller states in the vicinity of the Roman territory, which had been seized upon by successful adventurers, or were occupied by domestic tyrants, but over which the Church had always asserted her superiority whenever an opportunity occurred of enforcing its claims." And why not? "The city of Perugia was governed by Gian-Paolo-Baglioni, who, if we may believe contemporary historians, was a monster of iniquity and impiety; but the cruelty with which he exercised his usurped authority, rendered him no less an object of dread than his other crimes did of horror." And when Leo had got hold of this monster, he was forced to confess crimes which the historian says a "thousand deaths would not have expiated." So here we find part of the territory of the Church usurped by a "monster of iniquity." Was not the Supreme Pontiff justified in liberating his own subjects from the thralldom of such a "monster?" Yet with the characteristic inconsistency of a Protestant historian, when writing of the Papacy, Roscoe proceeds thus :—"From similar motives, and under similar prettexts," (as if in the former instance the motive was a mere matter of pretext,) "Leo attacked Ferino, then held by Frederici." But he goes on to say that "the fall of Frederici intimidated the petty tyrants who had possessed themselves of cities or fortresses in the march of Ancona," and that those of them who had com-

mitted the greatest enormities were executed. So we collect that in the opinion of a Protestant historian it is a mere pretext for a Supreme Pontiff to deliver his own territories from the yoke of tyrants, who commit the greatest enormities. In a similar spirit Roscoe speaks of the alliance which Leo formed with the Emperor, who had hereditary claims on Italy, to expel the French, who were only unrighteous invaders. "The government of the French," we are informed, "had given great dissatisfaction, insomuch that many of the noble and principal inhabitants had quitted the city, and taken refuge in different parts of Italy." The Emperor was to restore Parma and Piacenza to the Holy See, the rightful owners of those territories, and whose sway its subjects were able to appreciate, for Roscoe says that the "inhabitants expressed the greatest satisfaction on being restored to the dominion of the Church." Yet he insinuates it was culpable on the part of the Pontiff to have entered into an alliance with the view of recovering his own territories from a tyranny so galling, that it drove the inhabitants from their homes, and made them hail their restoration to the Holy See with joy. And he is awfully scandalized at the cardinal legates of the Church marching in the midst of the papal army, "preceded by their silver crosses," to the great degradation of their religion and office. Why so? Where could cardinal legates be better employed than in lending the high sanction of "their religion and office" to a "holy war," for the recovery of the patrimony of the Church from the oppression of a grinding tyranny? And where could the Cross be more fitly exhibited than as the symbol of the extension, or rather the restoration of its benign sway? That the sway of the Church was benign and mild, even Protestant historians, and the traditions and maxims of the middle ages amply attest. In that most valuable work of Gosselin, which the excellent translation of one of the Professors of Maynooth has recently placed before English readers, there are admirable observations as to the view which ought to be taken of the position of the Popes in the middle ages. And there is one passage in particular to which we crave attention: after alluding to the candid opinions of some able Protestant writers on the subject, the author observes, "The language of these Protestants is certainly a keen reproach to a great number of Catholic writers, who can never touch

on any of these delicate questions without introducing reflections most injurious to the Holy See and the Catholic Church." Referring especially to Leibnitz, he says: "The respect with which this great man, though a Protestant, has always spoken of the Popes, and his anxiety to exculpate them, are a lesson to some Catholics, who, pursuing a directly opposite course, labour to exaggerate all that is objectionable in the conduct or measures of the Popes; and who violate in this matter all the rules of decency and moderation." Most earnestly we commend these just, excellent, and stringent observations to "candid" Catholics, who in future may be tempted to circulate rash strictures upon so called "bad Popes."

But now we must beg the best attention of our readers to some remarkable observations of Roscoe, on the character of Leo X., which have an equal application to other pontiffs of whom we have spoken, and illustrate the views we have conveyed. Every word applies as well to Sixtus, Alexander, or Julius, as to Leo. "From the time of his pontificate to the present day, numerous causes have concurred in giving rise to erroneous opinions and violent prejudices respecting him, into which it may be necessary to institute dispassionate inquiry. That distinguished excellence or even superior rank and elevation is certainly attended by envy and detraction has been the standing remark of all ages, but independently of this common ground of attack, Leo was from various circumstances the peculiar object of censure and abuse. This liability to misrepresentation commenced with his birth, which occurred in the bosom of a city at all times agitated with internal commotions, and where the preeminent station which his family had long occupied, rendered its members obnoxious to the attacks and reproaches of their political opponents. Hence almost all contemporary historians may be considered as partisans either warmly attached or decidedly adverse to him: a circumstance highly unfavourable to the impartiality of historical truth. Another source of the great diversity of opinion respecting this Pontiff is to be traced to the high office which he filled, and to the manner in which he conducted himself in the political concerns of his times." Let the reader remark what follows. "As many of the Italian potentates during the wars which desolated Italy attached themselves to the cause of foreign powers, in like manner several of the Italian historians

have espoused in their writings the interests of other nations, and have hence been led to regard the conduct of Leo with an unfavourable eye, as the result of a restless and ambitious disposition. This indifference to the independence and common cause of Italy is observable even in the greatest of Italian historians, and has led Guicciardini unjustly to deprecate, rather than duly to estimate the merits of the pontiff. The same dereliction of national and patriotic spirit is yet more apparent in Muratori; who has frequently written with too great a partiality to the cause of the French monarchy; a partiality which is perhaps to be ascribed to the close alliance which subsisted between them, and the ancestors of his great patrons, the family of Este. It may be further observed, that Leo frequently exerted his authority, and even employed his arms against the inferior potentates of Italy (the tyrants of whom he had been writing, as guilty of crimes too great to be expiated by a thousand deaths,) "some of whom severely felt the weight of his resentment:" having been justly executed for the greatest enormities, and that these princes have had their annalists and panegyrists, who have not scrupled on many occasions to sacrifice the reputation of the pontiff to that of their patrons. To these may be added various other causes of offence, as well of a public as a private nature, unavoidably given by the pontiff in the course of his pontificate, and which afforded a plausible opportunity to those whom he had offended, of vilifying his private character, and loading his memory with calumny and abuse." There is not a word of which could not be equally as well applied to Alexander VI., to Sixtus, or to Julius, or to Leo, and much of it would be far more applicable to them than to him: for they were placed in circumstances far more trying, far more exposed to enmity and envy. It was Sixtus who commenced that movement on the part of the Holy See to recover its patrimony—which was continued by Alexander, carried on by Julius—and completed by Leo. He in a great degree realized the fruit of their labours. He found allies where they had only found foes; he came at a time when the contest was comparatively easy—when the rough work was done—when the assailants of the Church had exhausted much of their hatred, and worked to the utmost the foul weapons of calumny. He encountered only the last efforts of the storm against which they had struggled, in its fullest and

fiercest violence. He consummated the great work, and that it was a good one is proved by the result, the purification of Italy. It is an undoubted fact, that in the Pontificate of Leo, Italy enjoyed a greater degree of prosperity than before the Papal territories had been restored.

The character ascribed to Leo may, in a great degree, be attributed to Alexander. For Paolo speaks of his fondness for literature, his patronage of art, his wonderful sagacity, and his humanity. If in this latter quality any should suppose it absurd to imagine that Alexander resembled him, let it be observed that other writers deny it to Leo; and as we have seen, the received motives for calumny which existed in one case, existed to a greater extent in the other. The historian of the Council of Trent says of Leo, "He would have been a *perfect* pontiff if to other accomplishments he had united some knowledge in matters of religion, and a greater inclination to piety: to neither of which he appeared to pay any great attention." Even if this were so, it would be only proving that Leo was not a *perfect* pontiff, which we are far from affirming, either of him or of Alexander; but it is very far short of showing either of them to have been a bad Pope: and Fra Paolo proceeds to say, "scandal always delights to affix her spots on the brightest characters," and that the attention which Leo paid to amusements was in part attributable to the manners of the age, his high rank, and his natural disposition, and describes it justly as an imperfection (although not a trifling one) in the pontiff's character. But other Italian historians give a far better character to Leo, and a contemporary states that he diligently sought out men who had signalized themselves, *especially in theology*, which refutes the slander of Fra Paolo Sarpi, that he paid no attention to religion. And this would of itself be sufficient to show how little we can rely on the statements disparaging or disgraceful to the characters of the Popes; how likely they are to be lying inventions, arising out of some of those numberless bad motives which lead men to calumny. Even Erasmus eulogizes Leo for three great blessings bestowed upon mankind—of which one was the *restoration of Christian piety*. And this was the Pontiff who utterly neglected religion! Verily it is enough to make one exclaim with the Psalmist, "I have said in my heart all men are liars!" Unquestionably all men are so who "speak

evil of dignities;" for the more the truth is enquired into, the more will it be found that if there is ever any truth in what they say, it is certain to be largely mixed with falsehood. Happily Leo had an Erasmus to vindicate his character by his unimpeachable testimony. Some pontiffs equally calumniated, have been less fortunate in their fame, and have had no contemporary champions, and have been thrown on the charity of posthumous vindicators.

This was the case with Alexander, with Julius, and with Sixtus. And of these not all have found defenders even among posterity. We believe that to no nobler task can the intellect of a Catholic be directed, than in the vindication of these victims of the malignity of calumny. It is not necessary to make them out perfect; enough, to prove them not to have been wicked. It is not necessary to show them saints; sufficient to remove scandal. Happy have we been to labour, however humbly, in so sacred a cause: in vindicating the character of the Vicars of Christ. If we shall have removed one stone of that mountain of scandal which slander has heaped upon their memories, we shall not deem our labour lost; partly because it may serve to stimulate others to bring finer faculties to the noble task. And although we should be well content to rescue the maligned Pontiffs from the imputation of vice, we do not desire to confine their champions to that limited issue, nor despair of their characters receiving a far more complete vindication. We know that it is not the bad, but the good who are the victims of calumny; and that as it is only the wicked who calumniate, it is only the virtuous who are calumniated; and that in the teaching of our Divine Lord it is not praise but slander which is the test of sanctity. Knowing this, we consider that to prove these Pontiffs calumniated, is a great step toward showing them to have been good: and therefore do not despair of the bad popes turning out after all the best. What has been done for Gregory VII., or Innocent VIII., may yet be done for a Sixtus IV., or a Julius II.: aye even for an Alexander VI., and we have done something by general reasoning, or isolated illustrations, to establish if not the probability, at least the possibility, that to some future writer may be reserved the nobler triumph over calumny, the bringing out in light and truth the blackened characters of all the calumniated Pontiffs who are held up to execration as the bad popes.

ART. II.—*Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses connected with the Royal Succession of Great Britain.* By AGNES STRICKLAND, Author of "*Lives of Queens of England.*" Blackwood and Son, Edinburgh and London. 1854.

"ICI ils commencent par faire tuer un homme, et puis on lui fait son procès." The precedent that so alarmed M. de Porceaugnac is followed more frequently and more closely in every country than people at all suppose, and the posthumous justice administered by history is to the full as halting, as contentious, and as unreal as any process complained of in our own day. The infallible judgment of history, and its assured reversal of cotemporary injustice, is one of the hollowest, and precisely for that reason not least sonorous clap-traps, that ever deluded an enthusiast or heated even a cool head like that of Bacon, when he said he appealed from the judgment of the hour to foreign countries and posterity. All the fine things that Cicero has said of history—and they are very fine—apply, unfortunately, not to history as it is, but to history as it might be. They are true of a mere abstraction, and may be affirmed of history as certain qualities may undoubtedly be predicated of centaurs and hippocribs.

It is not pretended, of course, that this should be taken literally, but what we mean to convey is, that for the bulk of men, in these countries at least, no authentic or faithful history exists. Thousands will read the "*Child's History of England*," not so useful a production by half as the "*Child's Own Book*," for one that masters Lingard; while Pinnock's Goldsmith, not to speak of Hume and Smollet, will keep up the Protestant tradition in ten thousand schools, whose scholars will never dream of looking for anything more safe or correct. Some fair-minded men of all parties will profit by the labours of any faithful investigator, and range themselves on whatever side they are attracted to by the weight of evidence and light of demonstration; but the mass, even of the learned, will carefully guard the deposit of fiction that has come down to them, and even should the controversy divide them into camps,

the world at large will swear by Goldsmith, believe in the cruelty of Mary and virtue of Elizabeth, inevitably associate popery with slavery and wooden shoes, and cling with unshaken devotedness to the other truths of the glorious Reformation.

The history of Mary Queen of Scots sadly illustrates what we have been saying. It is conceded by those who view her character least favourably, that none of the proceedings by which it was attempted to colour her deposition or death, were in any respect trials, whether as regards the competency of the jurisdiction, the character of the judges, or the machinery of the investigation. But if Mary had no trial for her own benefit before death, her subsequent trial has lasted for the benefit of posterity well nigh three centuries, and is likely to last as many more; though not very long since everything seemed to promise the exhaustion of the enquiry. The discoveries of successive explorers have been scrutinized by careful and candid, as well as jealous and hostile criticism. Miss Strickland's *Life of Mary Stuart* is the work of an undisguised admirer, and we are bound to add not unsuccessful apologist of that unfortunate princess. M. Mignet, whose work upon the same controversy we noticed in a former number of this Journal, is very frequently at issue with our authoress, as might be anticipated from the general difference of their views, and she is by no means hesitating in her opinion of his merits. For our own part, it is the result of our experience, such as it is, that a claim set up by any man to a perfectly balanced judgment and entire freedom from prejudice, raises a vehement presumption that his judgment is far weaker than his self-esteem. M. Mignet in his *preface*, it will be admitted, reaches that commanding eminence from which all party and religious predilections diminish and fade, but once out of the preface he finds his level. His miracle resembles that of Simon Magus; he has strength to jerk himself into the air, but at a certain height his gods desert him, and he drops. But Miss Strickland, though she makes slight, we should rather say, no pretensions to impartiality, is by no means dogmatical, and seldom speaks without at least some degree of warrant for what she advances. Rather more chatty and familiar than quite beseems an historian, she is not at all trifling or sketchy, and very few writers satisfy you more completely of the soundness of her

views, when they are sound, than Miss Strickland. This is owing most probably to the absence of affectation, whether of earnestness or candour, and the consequent conviction left upon your mind that all she allows you to see of herself, or the subject of her biography, is genuine. That some of her views should be erroneous, is of course inevitable, and that some inferences should be strained, is as little surprising, but it is not to be denied that there is scarce one of the principal controversies in connection with the name of Mary Stuart on which she has not thrown some light, and amassed considerable materials for judgment, investigating evidence and collecting proofs with great ingenuity and great fairness, qualities that often have been thought to exclude each other.

Nor should we be justified in overlooking the obstacles by which the subject is cumbered at every step. The difficulty of appreciating the character of Mary with perfect calmness, has been felt and admitted by most who are at all conversant with her history and the history of her times—

“Who can be wise, amazed, temperate, furious,
Loyal, and neutral, in a moment?”

We have to bear in mind, or else to put aside, the peculiar circumstances of her sex and education, the people amongst whom she was reared, and those whom she was born to govern, the storms she had to buffet, and the reeds on which she had to lean—we must be on our guard against the fascination she threw over so many, and equally upon our guard against the dishonesty of her enemies, being bound withal to avoid the danger that may result from that affectation of impassability which has often turned aside the honest and well-intentioned from their obvious duty through fear of being supposed to favour what might be considered their own side of a question, or that to which their tastes and principles might be thought to incline them.

In the history of Mary, nearly all the sources of information were at one time tainted, or at least doubtful. It was strictly a case of circumstantial evidence, and is so to a certain extent even yet; so that friends and foes were obliged to resort largely to conjecture and special pleading, in the absence of any more substantial materials. That

state of things however, has been greatly altered by the labours of Tytler, Labanoff, and (we may be permitted to add) of our authoress. We have already in the notice of M. Mignet's work which appeared in No. LXIII, entered somewhat at large upon the matters in dispute as suggested by his volumes, and perhaps it would be convenient to give a brief resumé of what was attempted in that paper, and it will appear how fully most of our positions are sustained by the subsequent investigations of Miss Strickland, which, though they have not brought to light much that is new, have nevertheless elicited facts and dates of trifling individual importance, but certainly corroborative of more important facts and inferences.

The first consideration that forces itself upon any tolerably honest student of this strange history is the difficulty, perfectly unexampled, we boldly affirm, of Mary's position on her return to Scotland. She reached that country at the age of nineteen, after a probation of twelve or thirteen years in a court supposed to be the most corrupt, as it was, even then, the most refined in Europe. She was recent from an atmosphere the most trying to the soul's health, the most redolent of deadly sweets, the most pernicious to every moral sense and virtuous susceptibility, of any that was known, and she left it after having worn the matrimonial crown without any impeachment of honor, or any corruption of heart. The moment she touched the soil of her native kingdom, instead of duty and homage, she met with stiff knees and stubborn wills; the Church was a prey to Calvin and the Commonwealth to anarchy. She had traitors at her council, traitors in her family,—she was served by traitors at home, and represented by traitors abroad. The chief business of her few friends was not to train her hand to government, to suggest administrative measures, to open the treasures of their hoary experience at her feet, or freshen her policy by the vigour of their young and impetuous genius; it was no business of theirs to aid her in the development of the country's resources, or in resistance to the country's enemies—the utmost they could do was to put her on her guard, to foster continual suspicion, to keep up a perpetual system of checks and counterchecks, to indoctrinate her with dissimulation as the most elementary, as perhaps the only means of self-sustainment, and in their loyalty and truth to destroy the perfection and symmetry of a mind as

delicately and as nobly organized as any that ever adorned a throne or blessed a nation. Let her compose her looks or actions in Holyrood as she might, they were perused and reported by the secret-service-men of England. In her invaded Churches, she was denounced by Knox, and his fellows in the judaised slang of the time; the priest was stoned in her domestic chapel; and the royal progress marked its stages by insults. The factions that tore each other in the court and in the country, were all alike the pensioners of England, and the enemies of their Queen. Her vigour, her mercy, her loftiness, her meekness, her gaiety, her seriousness, her conscientiousness, her toleration were equally odious, and equally unfortunate. Her steps, her glances, her words, were scored and registered. It was every man's study to trip her in her speech and ambush in her path. And thus beset, thus waylaid, thus trapped, thus baited, were she from nineteen to twenty-five to have erred, not indeed so deeply and so grievously as her accusers represented, but still seriously and even fatally, it could not be matter of surprise.

This however, was the habitual and, so to speak, the normal condition of Scotland in her reign. But if we look to the extraordinary miseries of her union with Darnley, that impracticable malignant, that miracle of treason and ingratitude, whom no kindness could propitiate, and no law could bind; who was destined for the slaughter from the first, and confederated with the slaughtermen to degrade and depose her who had made him the partner of her throne; and if, in connection with all these circumstances, we take and draw together the good, the gentle, the womanly, the *queenly* qualities; the firmness, the tact, the moderation, the forbearance, the lovingness of Mary, as instanced by the indisputable facts we find in her historians, and in none more graphically than Miss Strickland; we find it difficult to conceive, even if more positive and peremptory arguments were not at hand, how one so wonderfully endowed could be so vicious and yet so silly, could unite in so uncommon a degree the dupe, the knave, and the blunderer, as Mary is represented to have done.

The inaccuracies of time and place which Miss Strickland detects, and exposes in Mary's adversaries, are nearly all of primary importance, and surprisingly numerous. Even taken by themselves, they have a strong absolute value, as demonstrating the impossibility of many of

the occurrences deposed to by her enemies, having taken place, at least in the way and at the time alleged; but if we couple these positive facts, drawn from documents often hostile, and from records that cannot err, with the antecedent improbability we derive from Mary's well-known tastes and feelings, we have a body of proof sufficiently substantial to support a very decided conviction of Mary's innocence, though not to absolve her from all blame of rashness, favouritism, disregard of warnings, and misplaced reliance upon thrice convicted traitors. What gives the strongest corroboration to Miss Strickland's figures, if they stood in need of any, is the simple explanation of which Mary's acts become susceptible by their aid. And even without the resource of these dates and places, the very acts most inculpated in the Queen will be found in perfect harmony with her character and conduct, at times when suspicion had not pointed at her; so much so, that there is scarce an action of hers in reference to Bothwell, if we except her marriage, that is not in strict conformity with her treatment of and demeanour towards some of her most relentless enemies, and as has been shown by Miss Strickland, nothing more than the relations between Mary and one of her principal ministers could warrant.

As we had occasion to observe in the former essay to which we have alluded, the controversy on this matter has regard to three heads of accusation, under which all the minor charges, grave enough, to be sure, in their nature, easily range themselves. We mean the intimacy of Mary with Rizzio, her imputed complicity in the murder of Darnley, and the participation in the plot for the assassination of Elizabeth, which was the immediate pretext for her death. On each of these points, as we noticed at the time, the judgment of M. Mignet, if it be not an abuse of the term so to speak, or, at any rate, his impressions, and those he seemed anxious to communicate to his readers, were adverse to the conclusions of those who are disposed to acquit the Queen of Scots. His opinions we found it difficult to reconcile with portions of the evidence, or with the weight of evidence generally. His admission or rejection, we ought rather to say suppression, of evidence, was completely arbitrary and unexplained, circumstances which, if not absolutely badges of bad faith, are hardly consistent with the conscientious care which should be

taken by any one who assumes to enlighten public opinion ; and, as we remarked, no one could fail to be struck by the proof-positive style of his allegations in places where proof was entirely wanting, and the presumption even not very strong. The instances there given of his peculiar manner of treating contested allegations, will hardly have escaped the recollection of those who have followed the enquiry with any degree of interest. His preference for the tattle of Randolph to the researches of Tytler as to Mary's connection with Rizzio ; his reliance on the hostile evidence of her share in the murder of Darnley, without even so much as glancing at the fact that it had been impugned ; and the oracular decisions he did not scruple to pronounce upon such evidence ; the coolness with which he announces that he has established the authenticity of the letters in the famous silver casket ; and the fashion after which he did establish them in the Appendix, by the simple and obvious process of garbling and almost totally suppressing the arguments upon the other side ; were all so open to criticism, that though disposed to notice his work in a not unfriendly spirit, our strictures upon them might be regarded as severe. It would be quite beyond our purpose to travel over the identical line of argument we there followed, or repeat the circumstances which go to impeach the genuineness of those letters on which the whole superstructure of defamation rests—but it gives slender promise of the close of the controversy, when a writer of ability and experience, totally, or nearly so, leaves out of consideration the allegations of one side. It is, in fact, a kind of pleading without traverse, or justification ; it is the reply of an advocate without allusion to the reasoning of his opponent, or of a disputant in syllogistic argument, who impugns his adversary's thesis, without attempting to deny his premises : and the slight retrospect we have allowed ourselves of our former paper by no means encourages us to look for that general and decisive vindication of Mary's character, which ought to result from labours such as those of Miss Strickland. For what hope is there that those who overlook broad facts, and forbear all mention of serious and undecided questions, to say the least, will condescend to small rectifications of dates or minute topographical dissertations ; on which, nevertheless, questions of the gravest import will depend, whilever truth is simple, and liars have need of good

memory? And if this was the case with M. Mignet, who, notwithstanding his avowed admiration of his own religious system, identical with that of Knox, claims to be an impartial arbitrator between the conflict of opinions, in virtue of adopting one set and drawing his pen through the other; how will it fare with us in these countries, where none but a few privileged and highly-endowed spirits can escape from a charmed circle, and a very contracted one, of traditional prejudices? M. Mignet, as we observed, notwithstanding the scant justice he allowed to Mary, did ample justice to the vulgar cruelty of Elizabeth; but what was Mary to expect from those who canonize her executioner? Persons of that class will believe undoubtedly with M. Mignet, that the affirmation of the Scottish privy council is a sufficient voucher for the authenticity of those letters; on the presumption, no doubt, that the council-chamber had some inherent efficacy to work loyalty in traitors, simplicity in intriguers, truth in suborners, ruth in assassins, and generally to change individual scoundrelism into an aggregate of honesty, just as pious Catholics believe a Pope, however weak in government, infallible in cathedrâ. The same robust faith will teach the great majority to concur with M. Mignet in believing the letters more fully authenticated still, by the verdict of the English commission, after a private examination by themselves, and after inspection of the alleged originals, denied to the unfortunate accused; and it is hardly to be doubted they will be easily led to acknowledge that torture, however the question of expediency may turn now, was a likely way of eliciting the truth at the time, and that depositions so obtained are to be admitted without question. On minds of this stamp anything like argument is lost, and unfortunately they are the more numerous, for a time at least.

Under this conviction we should have less hope of a good result from the investigations of almost any other author, how meritorious or learned soever, than of Miss Strickland. She has established for herself an honourable character of sincerity and independence, that is of the utmost advantage to her client, as we must look upon Queen Mary. In her pages will be found abundant matter confirmatory of our own views, but having developed some of these rather at length, or at such length as we could afford already, it might be more desirable to take

a glance at Miss Strickland's manner of dealing with those to which we gave less prominence at the moment, but the elucidation of which cannot fail to influence in a very great degree the main questions to which they are referable.

The imputation first in order, of those sought to be fastened upon Mary Stuart is, that her connection with Rizzio was of a nature to alarm the reasonable susceptibilities of her husband, and farther to *justify* that alarm. It is not to be denied that her relations with her secretary might have been, and naturally, nay, inevitably, were offensive to the political antipathies of her subjects; and it will readily be conceded that they were not such as prudence or circumspection would warrant; but no one who has read, we will not say, Miss Strickland's account, but who has had access to the documents which she, in common with others, have consulted; will fail to reach the conclusion that the charge of any impropriety in the Queen's intercourse with her secretary is entirely unsupported, and not even constructed with ordinary skill. The deformity of the ill-favoured little vocalist, whom Mary promoted to a place so near her person, would seem in itself to disarm suspicion, and to be a circumstance of all others the most likely to recommend him to the notice of a young and widowed sovereign, for a post of that description, which could not be held for an hour by those of more exalted position, or more imposing exterior, without raising presumptuous hopes, or at least provoking censorious tongues. In him were united a deformity which could not but be an antidote to passion; a meanness of extraction which no ambition, how vaulting soever, could remedy, and talent equal to the nice and nervous task of conducting the foreign correspondence of a princess, so beset from within and without; plied with offers of marriage from almost every unmarried prince in Europe; already connected by so many ties with the house of France; and jealously watched at home by more than one pretender. There were, of course, inconveniences attending the selection made by Mary, and in truth it is difficult to see what selection she could have made that would not have proved fatal, or at least disastrous. The insignificance and ugliness of his person, coupled with the lowliness of his origin, and foreign birth, rendered him particularly odious to the half savage nobles, who, with the characteristic vanity of

savages, had such sublime ideas of their own merit; though, had the position been held by one of themselves, and that one admitted to so confidential an intercourse with their beautiful sovereign; it is not in the nature of things that the jealousy, as well as the pride of the others should not have been exasperated to the utmost. Most assuredly those who wrought so industriously to destroy her husband's influence, would not endure to have her closeted with a noble and handsome secretary. But the strongest proof that his influence over the Queen, if different in kind or degree, from what their official relations warranted, never exceeded the bounds of friendship, is the fact that Darnley, in the very springtide of his courtship, attached himself to Rizzio, as well from congeniality of tastes with the Queen in love of music, as from a desire to interest the influential secretary in his suit, which he did effectually, and for all, so fatally. Had Darnley suspected a rival, or worse than a rival, and even were his ambition such as to make a Queen, however sullied, a prize worth any risk; he would have antedated Rizzio's hour, and found other means to reach the hand of his mistress than the pleading or intrigue of her reputed minion. We now quote Miss Strickland.

"The Earl of Moray withdrew from Stirling in disgust, declaring that he could no longer endure the superstitions practised in the chapel royal, after he had rendered the Queen as uncomfortable as he could, by his ill-will to Darnley, and his jealousy of the daily increasing importance of David Rizzio, who was observed to spend much time by Darnley's bedside, to whom he carried all the secret business of the court and council chamber. David was now performing in the absence of Lethington the functions of secretary of state, and in effect was the Queen's principal adviser since the mysterious bond of friendship that had united him with Darnley. Rizzio was suspected of moving the Queen to wed Darnley; but suspicion, which generally outstrips the truth, fell far short of it in this matter, for the research of that illustrious northern antiquary, Prince Labanoff, has brought to light a contemporary record which indicates the fact that nearly four months before the solemnization of their nuptials in Holyrood, Mary Stuart and Darnley were married privately at Stirling castle, in David Rizzio's apartment, which he had fitted up as a Romish chapel for that purpose."

* * * * *

"In promoting Mary's marriage with Darnley, her deformed

Piedmontese secretary acted in a manner which completely refutes the calumnies subsequently devised by his murderers for the twofold purpose of justifying their own guilt, and impugning the reputation of their royal mistress. Political malice will assert any absurdity; but who can believe that a courtier, occupying the position slanderously assigned to David Rizzio, in the favour of a young and beautiful female sovereign, would have wished to see her united to a prince, in the flower of his age, whose personal attractions and graceful accomplishments had already captivated her fancy, and might naturally be expected, to gain paramount influence over her heart? The part of a faithful servant, anxious to secure the happiness of his royal benefactress, had been performed by David in recommending her to wed a consort likely to prove agreeable to herself and acceptable to her English friends, and by uniting her claims with his, to strengthen her title to the royal succession of that realm. Up to this period the conduct of Darnley had been popular and good; nor could his greatest enemies urge a single point in which he had laid himself open to attack."—Vol. iv., pp. 115, 118.

Some pages further on, the triumph of Rizzio on the success of his co-operation with the wishes of his queen, and the object of her choice, is proclaimed by himself, in terms little like those we should expect from a discarded minion, or even a supplanted favourite.

"'Te Deum laudamus—it is done and cannot now be broken,' was the exultant exclamation of Mary's lively little Piedmontese secretary, in response to the thrilling echo of the long amen that pealed through the stately aisles of Holyrood chapel, at the conclusion of the sponsal rites, for he was well aware of the informality of the private marriage between the princely cousins which had been plighted three months before at Stirling, in his chamber, to sanction such near relatives in contracting wedlock with each other. Poor David, whom Melville terms 'a pleasant fellow,' had truly performed the part of the bridegroom's friend upon the present occasion, by rejoicing vehemently in his joy, and deserved not the payment it was his hard lot to receive from the fickle and ungrateful boy-husband of Mary Stuart."—Vol. iv. p. 168.

Miss Strickland does not appear to lay much stress upon the fact of Rizzio being the real or reputed contriver of a Catholic counter-movement in Scotland. The conspirators who nourished the vanity of Darnley were not less hostile to him than to Rizzio; and they flattered with the prospect of reigning over them, the man whom those that were in their councils, or had sagacity enough to see

through them, predicted they would not suffer to live. The crime of Darnley, in their eyes, was his natural, and if he knew how to use it, his legitimate influence over the Queen—the crime of Rizzio in Darnley's was his unwillingness to desert his mistress, and take part in the conspiracy. The rebel lords who joined in the bond for the assassination of Rizzio, might possibly have been under the influence of fanaticism, or it would at least have furnished them with a plausible and consistent plea, but that Darnley, who was a violent speculative Catholic, should have espoused the interest of the ranters he so despised, was too gross an absurdity even for the easy digestion of the time. The leading fact throughout this lamentable chapter of Mary's history is the perfidious desire of Darnley to compass the supreme power at any price, and the advantage taken of his folly by those who alone were destined to enjoy it. He was, in fact, like William III., impatient of the position of prince consort, but unlike William he did not honourably stipulate for a different position at the outset. He accepted the place, and took on the yoke, a light and sweet one surely, and then plotted to deprive his benefactress of crown, liberty, and it might be, life; for he very coldly makes provision in his bond with the confederates, for the event of her death; securing the devolution of the crown first to himself, and then, to his *father*: a speculation which would seem to have contemplated a more tragical sequence of events than ensued, at least immediately, upon the assassination of Rizzio in the chamber of the Queen; the death, in short, without dagger or potion of his wife, and unborn offspring, at the bare sight of the horrors perpetrated in her presence.

It would hardly be credited that the first cause of estrangement between Darnley and Rizzio was the unwillingness of the latter to accompany that misguided prince to a disorderly house; and it will add little to the credit of the Queen's traducers, that, according as Rizzio's favour with Darnley diminished, Moray, the prime mover of every plot against her person and government, and the chief conspirator in this especial matter, sought every means to propitiate his victim, and lull his suspicions; but we have proof of every particular from hostile sources. Randolph speaks in terms, of his eagerness to secure the sovereign power. "I cannot tell," he says, "what mis-

liking of late there hath been between her grace and her husband; he presseth earnestly for the matrimonial crown which she is loth hastily to grant, but willing to keep in store until she know how well he is worthy to enjoy such a sovereignty." In another letter to Leicester, speaking of Darnley, he says, "I know that there are practices in hand between the father and the son to come by the crown against her will. I know that if it take effect which is intended, David, with the consent of the king, shall have his throat cut within these ten days. Many things grievouser and worse than these things are brought to my ears, yea, of things intended against her own person, which, because I think better to keep secret than write to Mr. Secretary; I speak not to them, but now to your Lordship."

The duty of an ambassador, at least of an English ambassador in those days, it will thus appear, was not confined to its modern limits of telling lies in other countries for the benefit of your own. He was understood to be perpetually guilty of what in a subject would be most terrible misprision of treason, and something more; he was to be the depository of designs for the assassination of the Sovereign's friends, for her own deposition, perhaps death; and give all the support and countenance he could to such designs, without committing those who sent him,—and it is on the authority of such a man as that, and of the still more guilty, and still less trustworthy Scotsman, nearest to the throne in office and in blood, who corresponded with him; that we are to believe every villany they think fit to charge upon her to whom no one movement was possible that would save her from censure or perhaps from destruction. We shall close this branch of the subject with an extract which sets forth the real motives of Darnley and the other conspirators in the assassination of David Rizzio.

"In the midst of the fetes and public entertainments given by Mary and Darnley at Holyrood Abbey, in honour of the Earl of Bothwell's nuptials, the conspiracy for depriving Mary of her regal authority was actively proceeding. The history of that conspiracy has been little investigated by those who, misled by the libels of Buchanan and the narration of the assassins, imagine Darnley's absurd jealousy of David Rizzio to have been the exciting cause, and the assassination of that defenceless foreigner the principal object of a league which included not only the excited Scotch

lords and their confederates at home, but the leading members of the English cabinet, the English sovereign herself, and her authorities at the border. Elizabeth would have cared nothing for the conjugal wrongs, had such existed, of her contumacious subject, in a marriage contracted by him in defiance of her express prohibition, but it suited well her astute policy to allow her ministers and secret-service men to tamper with his ambition and folly in order to render him the instrument in destroying the wife of his bosom, and those hopes of a successor which had strengthened Mary Stuart's government in Scotland, and rendered her party in England too formidable to be contemplated without uneasiness. Elizabeth had uncourteously refused to treat Darnley as the king consort of Scotland, but through her emissaries she gave him every reason to expect support from her in case he should be induced to make a bold attempt to wrest the regal authority from his wife. So far was the murder of Rizzio from being the original object of this confederacy, that he was actually wooed by Darnley in the first instance to become a party to it; and if he could have betrayed the cause of his royal benefactress, he would have reaped any reward he might have pleased to demand; for being the channel through which all Mary's private foreign correspondence was carried on, he could doubtless by his revelations have furnished some more plausible pretext for her deposition and judicial murder. But Rizzio refused to play the Judas, and considered it, moreover, his duty to warn the Queen that some iniquitous intrigue was on foot, to which her husband, with his father, and some of the confederates, with the banished lords, were parties. Mary at first knew not how to credit this sad intimation, but having ascertained that a secret meeting of suspected persons was to take place one evening in her husband's chamber, she entered unexpectedly and surprised them together. The guilty conclave exhibited signs of confusion and dismay, but Darnley assumed an imperious tone of conjugal authority, gave her ungentle words, accused her of listening to spies and tale-bearers, and of watching him, and intruding her company when not desired by him. Mary proudly withdrew, and entered her husband's apartments no more. Darnley's personal vanity was piqued by this assumption of coldness and disdain on the part of the royal beauty; and although it had been caused by his own unkindness, he put on the airs of an injured person, complained resentfully of her 'coying him,' and imperiously pretended to believe her personal estrangement was caused by preference for another.

"The only man with whom the Queen was much in private, was David Rizzio, and this the nature of his office rendered necessary; while the defects of his person were such as almost to defy scandal itself to insinuate that she who was esteemed the most beautiful princess in the world, could prefer him to the husband of her choice, a prince so eminently distinguished by nature, with external graces

of form, features, and complexion, and who excelled in riding, dancing, tilting, and all manly and courtly exercises.

"The testimonies of David Rizzio's ugliness and deformity are numerous. At the head of these stands Buchanan, who writes that 'his face spoiled his ornaments and rich dress,' and that 'the Queen could not amend the defects of his person.' Another contemporary author of '*Le livre de la Mort de Marie Stuart*,' printed in 1657, declares he was '*disgracié de corps*,' and of mature years, but great sagacity; the author of '*Martyre de Marie*' says: the credit he enjoyed with his mistress was not on account of any beauty he possessed, being an old man and ugly, swarthy, and ill favoured, but because of his great fidelity, wisdom, prudence, and many other excellent endowments.' Connaco declares that he was old and deformed, but of spotless faith, and possessed of rare talents. Louis Garzon, *Conseiller de finances* to the King of France, gives the most conclusive testimony of all, for he says, 'I was well acquainted with David Rizzio, from whom I received many civilities in that court. He was in years, of dark hue, very ill favoured, but of a rare prudence, and very skilful in business.' But inasmuch as the doom of this faithful servant had been sealed from the hour he refused to join in the conspiracy against his royal benefactress, it was necessary to draw some scheme for shedding his blood. The confidence reposed in him by the Queen rendered him as a foreigner, very obnoxious to the national prejudices of the nobles, and his devotion to his unpopular religion made him an object of ill-will and suspicion to the people in general. It was industriously reported that he was a pensioner of the Pope, and intended to use his influence with the Queen for the overthrow of the Reformed Church, and this might possibly be true, yet is certain he had done nothing either to furnish matter for impeachment, or a criminal process, or there would have been no necessity for the lawless proceedings to which his enemies resorted, nor yet for the absurd calumnies whereby they sought to excuse their crime. The murder of David Rizzio was, however, only intended as the opening move in the attack on the Queen, and in this it was expedient to obtain the co-operation of her besotted husband.

"Meanwhile the Earl of Morton, who had first incited Darnley to enter into those treasonable intrigues against the Queen, suddenly forsook the meetings of the conspirators and appeared disposed to abandon the league. Alarmed at his demeanour, the confederates sent Andrew Kerr of Faudonside, and Sir John Bellenden, the justice clerk,—that great law officer being, to his eternal disgrace, a coadjutor in the treason,—to inquire the cause of his alienation. Morton replied that it was on account of the King's persisting in claiming the Earldom of Angus; and was with some difficulty persuaded to meet him in the Earl of Lennox's Chamber. A family treaty was entered into then and there, whereby Darnley and his

father renounced once more for themselves and Lady Lennox all claims on that patrimony in favour of Morton's nephew and ward the young Earl of Angus. This sacrifice having purchased the full co-operation of Morton in their enterprize, the bond or secret articles were drawn between Darnley and the banished Lords, in which it was stipulated that Darnley should obtain their pardon and recall, on condition that they should obtain for him the crown matrimonial of Scotland, and that in the event of the Queen's death, he should be declared the rightful successor, and his father next heir after himself, and that the Lords would pursue, slay, and extirpate all who opposed this resolution. * * *

The cause of religion was of course brought prominently forward in the general and more public bond, yet what grimace was this for Darnley, the most violent and bigotted Roman Catholic in the realm; he who had done what Mary never attempted to do—inhibited John Knox from preaching, rated the lords for not going with him to Mass, tossed the psalm book into the fire, and swore he would have a mass in St. Giles'—now pledging himself to keep the religion as it had been established by the Queen, that wise and tolerant princess whom they were preparing in return to supersede in favour of so unworthy a successor. Small was their care for religion, but Darnley had guaranteed to them the possession of their unlawful acquisitions, the mammon of unrighteousness being their idol. 'The King and his father subscribed the bond,' says Knox, 'for they durst not trust the King's word without his signet.' Lennox undertook the office of returning to England that he might assure Moray and the other outlaws they might return with safety. It must be remembered that the reason Mary had refused to treat with them through the offered mediation of Mauvissière in the preceding September, was because they had conspired against her husband's life. Darnley and Lennox were now willing to pardon this on condition of their conspiring to overthrow Mary and transfer the Government of the realm to Darnley. Lennox, though a proscribed outlaw himself in England, was allowed to enter that realm and confer with Bedford and Randolph, his previous foes, and proceed to Newcastle without the slightest danger or inconvenience, for the English Government was well aware of all that was going on, and Moray had pledged himself to obtain through his friend Cecil the deliverance of Lady Lennox, with leave for them to join him and Darnley at Holyrood.

"The murderous instrument entitled 'Ane Bond, made by my Lord of Moray and certain other noblemen with him before the slaughter of Davie' is still in the charter chest of the Earl of Leven, at Melville, having the autograph signatures of the six banished Lords, headed by the Earl of Moray, who signs himself James Stuart. It is dated at Newcastle, the 2nd of March, 1565-6. On Sunday, the 3rd of March, began the general fasting at Edinburgh, which always drew a concourse of the most disaffected of the half-

judaised zealots of the west country into the metropolis. The pulpits sounded notes of alarm on the all-exciting subject of popery, and the lessons were chosen from such passages of the Old Testament, as might be most readily perverted to the antichristian purpose of warrants for slaughter and persecution."—Vol. iv. pp. 262-7.

Our last extract has been somewhat too copious to admit of our giving many more ; or going at length into descriptions of scenes of bloodshed and intrigue with which the reader is perhaps, and in all likelihood, too familiar. We pass over the never-ending quarrels and reconciliations of Mary and her husband, his wearisome sea-saw of repentance and relapse, and his final abandonment to the meanest and most besotting vices, that almost remind one of the downward course of Lord Byron, save that the latter had some rays of genius to make us pity his fall. Even in these tiresome but necessary details are found important facts, which, perverted by the traducers of Mary Stuart to her ruin, and long surviving to her obloquy, have repaid the generous toil of her apologists, by proving to be altogether different from what they have been represented, and furnishing them not only with arguments of the insincerity of her enemies, but positive evidence of her own uprightness and willingness to conciliate her husband so far as might be compatible with duty. We are also compelled, however unwillingly, to omit the painfully interesting details of all that immediately preceded the death of the wretched Darnley. Miss Strickland has faithfully and laboriously collected every circumstance tending to the exculpation of the Queen. Her unwillingness to have him go to France ; her tender reception of him at a time when she is represented as giving him only a hasty and contemptuous interview ; her rejection of the proposal of a divorce, an expedient so ready and so characteristic of the times ; her wasting sorrow which bespoke love and regret, not anger or the purpose of revenge, these and a hundred other circumstances, distorted by her accusers, and neglected as trivial, or totally lost sight of by her friends ; are to be found in their right places, and doing the proper service in Miss Strickland's pages. Kindness to her husband during the illness which preceded his murder, but which his enemies and hers have tortured into the most repulsive feature of her imputed guilt, by representing it as an effort of superhuman, almost of superdiabolical hypocrisy, to lull

the suspicions of her victim ; has been rightly brought into comparison with the cares which she lavished on him in his illness before their public marriage, or with those she devoted to her first husband, for Mary was no novice in the ministrations of a *sœur-grise*. Nor are the more negative proofs of Mary's innocence omitted, which, though they are not of equal weight with the others, are by no means fanciful or such as would be rejected in a case like this, which, as we have said, is one of purely circumstantial evidence. Suffering, as Darnley was, from that always terrible, but then most mysterious malady, the small pox ; one current of cold air, (and Mary, it would appear, well knew its effect,) was the only assassin needed ; affected tenderness in lifting the curtain of his litter, would have been worth barrels of gunpowder, false keys, and the other dramatic accessories that an assassin on her own account would never have thought of, unless besotted to the last degree, which Mary, of all women, assuredly was not. A more vulgar, but equally certain and almost as discreet a piece of management, would have been to tamper with his medicines. There was no danger of a post-mortem examination, and the art had been pushed to the most delicate refinements in that very age ; refinements, which happily for the interests of justice, have not been preserved to the members of our burial societies ; and yet we are to suppose, on the evidence of the alleged correspondence with Bothwell, that she sent her own physician to rescue her husband from the jaws of death, and adjourned her release ; merely for the gratification of hearing the explosion at Holyrood. The further circumstance, too, in opposition to M. Mignet, that the house in which Darnley was lodged was his own decided choice, and not that of Mary, is duly noted, and, indeed, we are not aware of a single matter omitted which could be introduced in favour of Mary, or in refutation of her accusers.

The only remaining point which our space will permit us to notice for the present is the way in which the Queen's alleged complicity with Bothwell, in her abduction to Dunbar, has been treated by Miss Strickland. It is well known that all who take part with Mary's adversaries regard the abduction, so soon to be followed by marriage, as a perfect sham—as an unusually transparent pretence, reflecting a credibility upon every previous charge that might have seemed doubtful, so as to convert suspicion

into certainty. The grounds upon which this position is maintained, are simple and intelligible enough; but we believe they may be reduced to three; the extraordinary favours lavished upon Bothwell previous to the murder of the king; the letters real or apocryphal in the silver casket; the marriage and subsequent demeanour of the Queen. Taken in themselves, the favours conferred upon Bothwell were certainly considerable, and the accumulation of functions and powers in his single person were formidable to a degree. But fortunately for the character of Mary they are not naked and unrelated facts. Her favour to Bothwell never equalled that extended to Moray and to others, and was in a great measure the growth of circumstances. That countenance began to be shown to him at a time when her motives were above suspicion, and when her love for Darnley was said by the English spies to be the result of enchantments and filters, the brewage we believe of Lady Lennox. By a brave, sudden, and skilful exercise of royal prerogative, which resembles in its vigour, as well as its duration, the bearing of Richard the Second, before Wat Tyler and his rout in Smithfield, she preserved the rights of Bothwell, though he remained for a considerable time afterwards in banishment. She knew he once had in contemplation the deed he afterwards consummated, and for that design had banished him, but whom had she not been obliged to banish and recall in turn? In the fond persuasion she was unassailable under the protection of a husband, she considered it safe, and even if dangerous, her sole resource in extreme peril; to recall Bothwell and reinstate him in his command. Her nobles, as a body, were traitors and rebels, and Bothwell, whatever else might have been his failings, was at least proof to seduction from England,—he was, in fact, the only one in the realm that had been in high office, and yet not in the pay of Elizabeth. At a moment when the great lords were actually in arms against her government, was she to neglect the aid of the most powerful nobleman in Scotland, who united in himself hereditary offices, not only of the greatest dignity, but of the most real importance, who had a principality under his dominion on the confines of her enemy, who was acknowledgedly the greatest and best soldier in Scotland, and who was above all, so far at least as the country was concerned, “one true amongst a host?” Confiding, as

we have every reason to believe she did, in the protection of a husband whom all admit her to have loved at the time, she recalled Bothwell, and from that period forward there was nothing in her relations with him more than those official relations strictly warranted. There have been no freedoms, certainly no public freedoms, imputed to her like those in which Elizabeth was accustomed to indulge, and which the presence even of ambassadors was unable to check; and the only proof which, however shadowy, has even the semblance of substance, must be looked for in the letters whose history, and that of the controversy regarding them, we endeavoured to give in the number of this Journal to which we have referred already. A stronger argument still against any of what may be called the remote proofs of her having lent herself to a concerted abduction, was the part she took in promoting the marriage of Bothwell with Lady Jane Gordon. Surely no one will pretend it could have been with a view to her union with Bothwell that she laboured so zealously for his marriage with another. Would it not rather seem, that regretting as she did the state necessity that forced her to employ so aspiring a servant, she determined as far as in her lay, to diminish the danger, whatever it might be, of his presence at her court, and of his influence in the country. As regards the actual abduction we shall draw upon Miss Strickland herself for the history and the reasoning.

“The Queen having been delayed and impeded by so severe an attack of illness on the very commencement of her journey, must have proceeded slowly, and could not have reached Linlithgow, where she was to pass the night, till late. It is natural to suppose that being exhausted with the pain she had suffered, and the fatigue of passing so many hours in the saddle, she would, in compliance with the advice of her physician, and the entreaties of her ladies, have retired to bed immediately on her arrival, taken composing medicine, and endeavoured to obtain the repose of which she was in need. It is asserted, nevertheless, on the authority of that extravagant tissue of falsehood put forth by Moray, under the name of the second confession of French Paris, that she had a second interview with the Laird of Ormistoun, one of the murderers of her husband, and sent a letter to Bothwell by him that same night.

“That the Laird of Ormistoun was never questioned on the subject of this alleged correspondence between Mary and Bothwell, in which he was alleged to have been employed as the bearer of these letters the night before her abduction, must be regarded as proof-

positive that nothing of the kind took place; for if such a fact could have been established by his evidence, no matter how extorted, it would have corroborated the assertion of the conspirators, that she acted under the influence of a guilty passion for the murderer of her husband. But as the confession of Ormistoun is silent upon that point, having been written down in the presence of the honest minister, Brand, who, though ranked with her foes, was too honourable a man to permit interpolations to be made for the purpose of dishonouring his hapless sovereign, the charge of her complicity with Bothwell rests solely on the unverified assertions of the usurpers of her regal power, the credibility of the eight letters produced by Morton, and the so-called second confession of Nicholas Hubert, *alias*, French Paris, who is made to confess delivering a letter to Bothwell a day before it could, according to its own showing, have been written; the 24th being plainly indicated by the allusion to the journey from Stirling, 'yesterday.' [April 23.] It will be necessary to quote this letter.

"My Lord,—Since my letter written, your brother-in-law, [Huntley, that was,] came to me very sad, and has asked me my counsel what he should do to-morrow, because there be many folks here, and among others the Earl of Sutherland, who would rather die, considering the good they have so lately received from me, than suffer me to be carried away, they conducting me; and that he feared there should some trouble happen of it of the other side, and that it should be said that he were unthankful to have betrayed me. I told him he should have resolved with you upon all, and that he should avoid, if he could, them that were most instructed. He has resolved to write to you by my advice."

"And here the usual discrepancy of falsehood confutes its own fictions, for the forger goes on to say,—

"We had *yesterday* three hundred horse of his and Livingstone's. For the honour of God be accompanied rather with more than less, for that is my principal care. I go to write my despatch, and pray God to send us a happy interview shortly. I write in haste, to the end you may be advertised in time."

"Thus we see a letter purporting to be written the day after the Queen had started from Stirling to Linlithgow,—consequently on the 24th of April, the day of her abduction—expresses the greatest uncertainty as to what Bothwell's intentions were, which is incompatible with the assertion in Paris' confession, 'that Bothwell very early on that morning made him the bearer both of a letter and a message to the Queen, telling her he would meet her the same day on the bridge.' So the letter confutes the confession, and the confession the letter, affording a striking illustration of the old proverb, that 'falsifiers require to have good memories.' * * * * *

"Instead of being guarded by an escort of three hundred horsemen, as artfully insinuated in the seventh of the supposititious letters, Mary was so slenderly attended on her journey from Lin-

lithgow to Edinburgh on the fatal 24th of April, that her train did not exceed twelve persons. Bothwell, who had meantime armed and mounted a thousand of his followers, rode boldly out of the west port of Edinburgh at the head of his company, apparently for the performance of his duty as high sheriff, which required him to meet her majesty at the verge of the county, to receive her with the customary honours due to the sovereign, and conduct her to her palace of Holyrood. His real object was to overpower and capture her in some lonely part of the road. He had, if Sir William Drury's information on the subject be correct, conferred very early that morning with his brother-in-law, Huntley, 'with whom he did directly break of his determination of having the Queen to Dunbar, which in no respect Huntley would yield unto.' It is possible, therefore, that it was in consequence of being warned by Huntley that she was in danger of being ambushed on the road, Mary either started earlier than was anticipated, or pushed forward with such unwonted speed to get into Edinburgh, that Bothwell, instead of surprising her, as he had calculated, in a lonely part of the old Linlithgow road, which then ran in almost a straight line near the sea coast, encountered her and her little train in the suburban hamlet, anciently called Foulbriggs, between Coultbridge and the West Port. If he had been ten minutes later she would have escaped him altogether, for she was within three quarters of a mile of the castle, and almost under the walls of Edinburgh, but near as she was to a place of refuge it was impossible for her to reach it. A thousand horsemen, mailed and equipped with weapons of war, were treasonably interposed between her and the West Port. Resistance to such a force was out of the question. Her attendants were disarmed and overpowered in a moment, and Bothwell dashing forward, seized her bridle-rein, and turning her horse's head, hurried her away with him to Dunbar as his prisoner. It is proper to verify this statement of the real place and manner of Mary Stuart's capture, not merely by a marginal reference to an authority inaccessible to the great body of my readers, but by a quotation of the very words of the act of parliament for the forfeiture of Bothwell and sixty-four of his accomplices, 1 James, VI., which, after reciting the murder of the 'late King Henry,' proceeds in these words:—'And also for their treasonable interception of the most noble person of our most illustrious mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, on her way from Linlithgow to the town of Edinburgh, near the bridges vulgarly called Foulbriggs, besetting her with a thousand men equipped in the manner of war, in the month of April last.' The fullest, the most satisfactory, and explicit testimony of the forcible nature of the royal victim's abduction follows in these words:—'She, suspecting no evil from any of her subjects, and least of all from the Earl Bothwell, to whom she had shown as great offices of liberality and benevolence as prince could show to good subject, he, by force and violence, treasonably seized her

most noble person, put violent hands upon her, not permitting her to enter her own town of Edinburgh in peace, but carried her away that same night to the Castle of Dunbar, against her will, and there detained her as a prisoner for twelve days." * * * *

"A vast amount of falsehood is overthrown by the parliamentary record defining the when, where, and how Mary's capture was effected by Bothwell. The act was framed within seven months after the offence was perpetrated, and it behoved to be correct, because several persons assisted in that parliament, as Huntley, Lethington, Sir James Melville, and others, who were not only present when the abduction was effected, but were carried away with their royal mistress as prisoners to Dunbar. The statute for Bothwell's forfeiture, reciting the overt treasons he had committed, was, moreover, proclaimed to the people of Edinburgh by the heralds, first from the windows of the Tolbooth, where the parliament then sat, then from the Market Cross, and other public places, in the ears of hundreds, who might actually have been eye-witnesses of the facts alleged.

"The credibility of the charges against Mary Stuart, charges no less opposed to probability than inconsistent with the whole tenor of her life, and holy calmness of her death, is grounded by her adversaries on her supposed collusion with Bothwell, when he made public seizure on her person, and carried her off to Dunbar, she having, as they pretend, secretly encouraged and excited him to that measure. But the united voices of the three estates of Scotland assembled in parliament under an influence so hostile to her, as to have robbed her of her crown and personal liberty, acquit her of all foreknowledge or suspicion of the designs of Bothwell. 'She suspected,' declares the act of his forfeiture, 'no evil from any of her subjects, and least of all from him.' He was her Prime Minister, her Lord Admiral, Lieutenant of all the borders, and High Sheriff of Edinburgh and the Lothians, whose bounden duty it was to meet and convey her, and defend her in case of danger, with his '*posse comitatus*.' She, therefore, 'suspected no evil,' and even if she had, resistance was impossible. It seems withal that he was provided with a plausible tale in reply to any remonstrance she might have offered, when he took her by the bridle-rein and turned her horse in a contrary direction to that in which she was proceeding, 'deceitfully assuring her that she was in imminent danger, and beseeching her to allow him to provide for her personal safety by allowing him to conduct her to one of his castles.'

"Without the slightest consideration for the fatigue of his royal victim, who had been suffering so recently from a severe and alarming attack of illness the preceding day, on her journey from Stirling to Linlithgow, Bothwell hurried the captive Queen the same night to Dunbar, a weary distance of twenty miles, she having already ridden from Linlithgow nearly to the gates of Edinburgh."

—Vol. v. pp. 269, 276.

It is impossible to disprove much more completely the charge of concert between Mary and Bothwell in her abduction. Every circumstance in the matter shows that although Bothwell's enemies favoured that imputation in the first instance, so as to secure him from interruption in the accomplishment of an enterprise which they knew would work his ruin, along with that of Mary; it was not put forward as a public charge upon the rolls of parliament, where it ought naturally to find its place, but that the very reverse was affirmed, even before it became the duty of James the Sixth, in regard to his mother's memory, to place on record her entire freedom from participation in that outrage. The fact of her marriage following so suddenly, is far indeed, from being decisive of her connivance in the abduction which led to it. Her total seclusion, and that other circumstance which it is enough to notice even thus darkly, which at the very least is incapable of being disproved, and which is reiterated in public documents; go far in explanation, though hardly in excuse, of this worst weakness in her life. What gives the matter a double aspect, rendering it doubtful whether the connection with Bothwell was on that account more criminal or less so, is the fact, very fairly suggested by Miss Strickland, that Mary, knowing the rules of the Church as well as she must have done, did not consider the marriage binding, and that she submitted to the vain ceremony in the hope of disarming the suspicions of Bothwell, and escaping at the earliest opportunity. We regret we are not at liberty to enter into the discussion of her attempted escape from Dunbar, and her recapture by Bothwell, as ill-starred as her original abduction. Few have made allowance for the effect of illness, abandonment, perplexity, and every element of irresolution by which she was encompassed; in producing a state of mind such as to disqualify her for resistance to the threats, violence, and importunity of Bothwell. On the other hand, it was not, in Mary's character to shrink from danger, or from submitting her fortunes to the arbitrament of war, as she had shown on more than one occasion; and therefore we are entitled to infer that her final abandonment of Bothwell was not from pure aversion to the shedding of blood, though her nature always recoiled from judicial executions, and to pardon was always more grateful to her than to condemn. These, and many other

arguments, fairly and ingeniously put, we have been obliged to notice thus cursorily, and to omit the greater number altogether. The proper course for the reader will be to consult Miss Strickland's volumes himself. There are some few things to which we might take exception, but they have no regard to the gist of the work. Notwithstanding that Miss Strickland is so generally well-informed, she falls into droll mistakes with regard to Catholic doctrine and practice, which show that a Protestant, however well-inclined or well-informed—and without wishing to be ungallant we may be permitted to say, a lady in particular—ought not to approach questions of the kind without satisfying herself as to the accuracy of her descriptions. In one instance she speaks of the Roman Communion as “the most corrupt form of the *Latin* Church,” a figure of speech which, though it has no designation proper in Aristotle or elsewhere, is not altogether unlike the similarity between “Cæsar and Pompey, especially Cæsar.” Again, she speaks of the dirge, as held by Catholics, essential to salvation; and in another place says the same thing quite as undoubtedly of the last sacraments. Perhaps if she prosecute her enquiries a little further, she will unlearn many of her existing ideas, but as far as we are ourselves concerned we can afford to forgive mistakes of this kind, when the spirit of the work in which they are found is so perfect. We take leave of the book, so far as it has gone, with a very sincere wish that what remains to be accomplished may be not less successful in its execution, and that its popularity may be equal to its deserts. It is not one of the essential properties of truth to be agreeable, and feeling that in proportion as the circumference of Miss Strickland's popularity enlarges itself, some ray of truth will reach a quarter yet unvisited, and some darksome recesses be illuminated, we cannot but wish her increase of strength, courage, and reputation.

ART. III.—1. *Fresenius' Instructions in Chemical Analyses.* London : Churchill.

2. *Galloway's Manual of Qualitative Analyses.* London : Churchill.

3. *Abel and Bloxam's Handbook of Chemistry.* London : Churchill.

4. *Faraday's Lectures.* London : Longmans.

IN our days, and in those of the generation that is now passing away, the science of chemistry has grown up from a puny stature into gigantic proportions, and with its giant's size has attained to a gigantic strength. Still with its colossal power and might it has, when this has been needed, refined upon its original delicacy. Ever in operation chemistry sometimes astonishes us with the tremendousness of its results, while at other times we are forced to admire the extreme minuteness of its proceedings. Chemistry can make explosive compounds that may destroy a city, and yet can detect in, and separate the hundredth part of a grain of arsenic from, the stomach of a poisoned man, or the one four hundred and fiftieth thousandth of a grain of iodine in a wine-glass full of mineral water. Chemistry directs the metallurgist in the management of his huge furnaces, and also the manufacturer of a pin ; it penetrates into the cook's kitchen, and yet the highest refinements of luxury, as far as material things can be, are dependent upon it for their properties. Without the assistance at least of chemistry, the powerful steam-engine would scarcely do its mission, and yet without it the soldering of a tin kettle cannot be rightly performed. If chemistry sometimes wields its power for the purposes of destroying life, by its means more food is produced, and from its stores medicine draws some of her most useful remedies. Yet all these powers, and much more, have been mainly acquired by chemistry in less than a century, and from the hour when Cavendish analyzed water to the other day, its onward course has been uniformly continuous. But even Jupiter nods, and for a moment as it were chemistry is reposing. Perhaps its slumbers are disturbed by vague dreams of allotropism, and like hypotheses, that are destined it may be to dim its hitherto unclouded

escutcheon, and give another proof that everything in this world, even science itself, is subject to error, and doomed too often to receive wounds from those who should be its guardians and protectors. Be this as it may, this present resting-time seems suitable enough for considering the history and present state of chemical science.

At first sight it would appear that the best plan of narrating the history of chemistry is, to detail the labours of the chemists of each succeeding age, but this is not so. As, when only some few hundreds of plants were known, the botanist could arrange them according to any artificial system that he pleased, but found it necessary, when the genera multiplied upon him, to arrange them into different *natural* families and orders, so it is with chemistry. It is indeed so extensive a science, or rather a series of sciences, that in narrating its career it is necessary, unless done on a very extended scale, often to merge individuals, and regard merely the rise and progress of great epochs. Even in doing this, it is sometimes necessary to sink chronology, for often we can trace the seed of a great principle that lies dormant for ages ere it is vivified into an existence. Perhaps the history of chemistry is naturally divided into that of 1st. the origin and progress of chemistry, among the ancient Semitic nations; 2nd. of the chemistry of the Arabians, and the alchemists, the latter being the first great outburst of methodic chemistry; 3rd. of Paracelsus, and his school, or of the first avowed school of empirical chemistry; 4th. of Van Helmont, and the new methodical school of iatro-chemistry; 5th. of the commencement of the re-establishment of the rational dogmatical school; 6th. of Black and the pneumatics; 7th. of Lavoisier and the French school; 8th. of Davy and the electrical school; and 9, of Liebig and the organic chemists.

Chemistry is essentially a science of the Semitic race, no nations not belonging to this great division of mankind having ever cultivated it with success. Indeed, its very name, *χημια*, is probably derived from our great ancestor Shem of the Vulgate, and Chem of the Egyptians. Farther, it appears almost certain that post-diluvian chemistry had its origin, certainly a humble one, in Egypt. History, tradition, and archæology, in fact combine to tell us that it was in this country that science of all kinds sprang up. The scientific inquirer, who considers the

physical geography and the geology of the country around Thebes, cannot fail to be struck with the suitableness of such a locality for the birth-place of chemistry. The first chemistry was unquestionably practical metallurgy, *i. e.* the extraction and management of the metals. If, then, we regard the geology around Thebes, we see that on the western side of the Nile there occurs to the north, limestone, then sandstone, and that both are intersected with primitive mountains of quartz, and long stretches of graywacke, or transition rocks. The eastern ridge of the Nile, also, pretty near to the Delta, has limestone formations, but as we go southward we find an immense quantity of granite, and when we arrive at Syene we come upon the worked quarries of that variety of it, called, from this circumstance, syenite. Between the Nile and the Red Sea the mountains are all primitive, and in about 28° of latitude we find in these primitive mountains the remains of what have been extensively-worked copper-mines. The valleys in this district, however, contain small formations of sandstone and primitive limestone.

Now gold occurs in the primary and transition rocks,* (whence it is generally washed away in grains by means of water,) copper in the same rocks and in sandstones; lead in the early limestone and sandstones, and also in the primitive; tin in the granite and transition rocks, and hematite or iron oxide in the primitive. That is, the Egyptian monarchy, of which Thebes was the capital, was surrounded abundantly by gold, and by ores of copper, tin, lead, and iron. It also contained a river, the banks of which varied much at different times of the year, and which would probably have in its mud a good deal of the gold that had been washed down from the primitive rocks, and the veins of quartz in the graywacke.

But the knowledge of metals was probably long antecedent to any familiarity with metallurgy. We know from archæology that there was a time when mankind was unacquainted with any metal that would form weapons or tools, and was consequently obliged to employ stone for the purpose, and yet was aware of the existence of gold and silver. We know farther, that in the very earliest

* Many parts of Egypt, and probably of the great desert on the opposite side of the Red Sea, likely contain much gold.

records these metals are spoken of as being quite familiar, and physical science points out to us that they are found in the beds of rivers that flow from primitive and metamorphic rocks. No doubt but that the early inhabitants of Thebes discovered these metals, and probably used them as ornaments. In order, however, to do this, no chemical knowledge whatever is necessary. But this is not the case with the two metals that we know mankind next discovered and employed. For we not only have the researches of the archæologists, but those likewise of ordinary antiquarians prove, that before the discovery of iron; copper, and, (but perhaps a little subsequently,) tin were known and used.* The alloy formed by these two metals constitutes bronze, and the metallic weapons and utensils of mankind were for a long time made of this compound. The tombs of the men of this bronze period never contain iron, and indeed, even Homer describes the weapons of his heroes as composed of copper, and although they were acquainted with iron, they are described as so unfamiliar with it, that Achilles offered an iron ball as one of his most valuable prizes at the games celebrated in honour of Patroclus.

The copper ore from which the Egyptians most probably extracted their copper, was the copper pyrites, or sulphuret of that metal. To obtain copper from this ore several processes of a chemical nature must have been gone through. The usual ore of tin is an oxide, and the details of the process followed to extract it would not be the same as in the case of copper, and the variation of the two processes and the necessity for the constancy of this variation imply a certain extended amount of practical chemical skill, and so also would the admixture of the two to constitute bronze.

Long after the bronze age had begun, and doubtless flourished after its own fashion, the art of extracting iron from its ores, and of the manufacture of that metal were discovered and understood.† The iron ore that the Egyptian metallurgists operated upon was almost certainly a hematite, and the mode of reducing the metal from it

* Perhaps the most interesting English work on this subject is Dr. Daniel Wilson's "*Archæology of Scotland*."

† See again Dr. Daniel Wilson's work as quoted above.

must have been different from the plan followed in the reduction of copper ore, and also most probably in that of the tin. Chemistry, even did it consist in traditional practices merely, had by this time not only commenced, but progressed.

The whole of the Egyptian chemistry was probably not communicated to the Greeks, and by them transmitted to the Romans. Nevertheless, among these two people chemistry continued in its own way to acquire at any rate new facts, and many of these undoubted ones. By the time of Constantine, (and with regard to most of the substances for long before,) the chemists of the empire knew, and could obtain all the pure metals as they are called, save one—platinum, and they likewise possessed zinc, although they confounded it with tin. Of the other, now ranked as elementary substances, they only knew sulphur. Their one acid was the acetic, but they had carbonate of soda, (which they called nitre), and potash. They were acquainted also with some metallic salts, and with alum, common salt, (marine salt), and ammoniacal salt, or our hydrochlorate of ammonia. Their knowledge of the earths and minerals was tolerable, and they were familiar with a good many oils, both fixed and essential. What was perhaps of still greater importance, they knew how to perform several chemical processes, such as crystallization, distillation, sublimation, expression, fusion, and many others. Their applications of chemistry, too, to the arts, were pretty numerous.

It is almost impossible, from our very imperfect evidence to decide as to how far the human intellect had gone in endeavouring to extract from the known facts of chemistry one or more general chemical principles. Something that had possibly been done in this way by the Egyptians was probably lost, and, moreover, the genius of the Greeks did not incline to what in our day is called mixed physical science, and the Romans were essentially an unscientific people. Still, we know that some little hypothesis was indulged in. The Greeks reduced all the forms of matter to the four elements of fire, air, earth, and water, but it would not appear that they understood the expression, element, in the same sense that modern chemists do, (viz., a substance that cannot, by any means that we possess, be resolved into two,) but under the name of the four elements they seem to have expounded a theory,

that all objects in the world were composed of air, earth, water, and fire, in which, after all, they were right enough. It has been supposed, too, that among the Egyptians at least, speculations were entertained to the effect that metals were compound in their nature, and some alchymists of a later date claimed the so-named Trismogistus as the founder of their art. But this is not supported by evidence, and quite contrary to all that history teaches us, of the progress of science. At first of all, (and indeed this holds good in almost everything connected with the mind of man,) isolated facts are diligently and laboriously stored; next in the healthy tone of early society, these, or some of these, are referred to principles, and these principles are more or less dogmatically taught. Rational dogmatism is created and transmitted to after generations, and always remains, however much it may suffer from passing clouds, the orthodox party. It is it that philosophically corrects previously established principles, that improves previous principles, or that adds new ones, always operating by the induction from observation of new facts, as connected with previous induction from previously observed facts. After a time two other plans of considering science invariably spring up. The one is that of Methodism, which, disdaining the cautious progress of rational dogmatism, striking out some new plan of her own, not from observation of facts, and consequent deduction, but from a fanciful hypothesis, or *method*, (whence the early name of this group of philosophical sectaries,) which is assumed as a law. The other is that of Scepticism or Empiricism, which denies the power of the human mind to generalize, and affirms that nothing is possible save for each individual to watch isolated facts. At any rate we shall see that this law holds true with regard to chemistry.

Some portion of the chemistry of the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans, had doubtless from time to time spread to Persia, to India, and to Arabia, but after the fall of the Roman empire chemical science was in abeyance, until the brilliant outbreak of the Mahommedan Arabs. From the founding of Bagdad, in the eighth century, to the decadence of the Arabians in the twelfth, they not only incessantly cultivated chemistry, and added very materially to its stores, but they created the school that existed among the western Christians from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. Indeed, they did more, for it was

amongst them that the first great methodical sect, that of the alchemists, arose.

In considering the history of the Arabian school, of which Geber and Avicenna may be named as the most illustrious members, it is necessary to remember that our knowledge regarding it is very imperfect. The Arabian chemists certainly very much affected the progress of chemistry, and in consequence of so doing became acquainted with many chemical compounds that were unknown to their predecessors. It is now, however, quite impossible to define the chemical theories of the purely Arabian school, and any consideration of them may be here omitted. It is, indeed, of more importance to notice the fact, that among the Arabians the study of chemistry was combined with the practice of medicine, and that mineral acids, alkalies, and metallic salts, were not only known, but therapeutically used. This was not the case among previous medical men, and the innovation (certainly an improvement) ultimately lead to important results.

Of all the events, however, that characterized the Arabian chemists, the most interesting was the rise and progress (at least on a large scale) of alchemy. The general idea of this was, that the metals were all compound substances, that the baser metals, as they called them, differed from gold merely in containing various contaminations, and that if these contaminations could be got rid of, pure gold would be the result. Considered in the abstract, alchemy is not unphilosophical. When we say now-a-days that the metals are elementary bodies, all that we mean is, that we cannot resolve any metal into two elements, although it is quite possible that this may be done. The absurdity of alchemy was this, that its votaries did not from facts deduce the compound nature of metals, and then try to separate the pure part from the impure, according to the proceedings of the rational dogmatists, but they took the theory first and hoped the facts would follow. Alchemy was the first great outburst of methodism as applied to chemistry. The principle of alchemy may become the established principle of our day, but if so it will be, at least it is to be hoped it will be, honestly and scientifically come by. But it was not so with the alchemists.

The notion that we have of the so-called philosophical stone that was to effect the purification of the metals, is

probably very different from that of the Arabian methodics. Much as we are entitled to blame the false methodic system of the alchemists, this powder of projection was probably a methodical preparation, and not, as modern writers assert, a mere empirical substance. Methodism is indeed an aberration from right thinking, a sort of delirium as it were, but not a total deprivation of it, as empiricism is. This philosopher's stone subsequently, and perhaps long subsequently, came to be also regarded as the powder of life, or panacea for all diseases, and preventer of the debility of old age.

The chemical school that arose in the twelfth and three succeeding centuries among the Christians of the west, was derived from the Arabs, and was certainly strongly tinged with alchemy. Alchemy, with its powders of projection, would have lost its patent character of methodism, so totally opposed in its spirit to mediæval, or at least to mediæval Christian, orthodoxy. But we have probably jumped far too rapidly to the conclusion, that alchemy was all, or, indeed, anything but a very subsidiary part of the mediæval chemistry. On the contrary, it was probably more of a speculation than anything else, and not an article of scientific faith so much as a source of investigation as a relaxation.

Almost every one of these early Christian alchymists were members of monastic institutions. The earliest of these who attained a reputation was Albertus Magnus, who died at an extreme old age, towards the close of the thirteenth century. He was a Dominican, and at one time bishop of Ratisbon, but being released from his episcopal charge, he retired to his monastery at Cologne, where his time was mainly occupied by scientific pursuits. He was not only acquainted with many chemical processes and products not known to the Arabs, but many of his opinions have become accepted doctrines of chemistry. He considered the metals to be compounds of mercury, sulphur, and water, and believed in the possibility of separating the gold that he thought to be contained in the inferior metals. St. Thomas Aquinas was a pupil of his, and *his* chemical writings are remarkable as containing some now-familiar chemical expressions. But we may perhaps take as the type of this school, Roger Bacon. Amongst the various branches of learning that this great man investigated, chemistry was one, and it is plain from

his writings, that although he held the view of the compound nature of metals, his attempts at extracting gold were based upon principles quite compatible with science and philosophy, and his only statements about the reality of the philosopher's stone are, that others affirmed that they possessed it. In this respect his memory has been very unjustly calumniated by Voltaire. Bacon is surely no more to be blamed for speaking of others affirming that they could manufacture gold, or construct the powder of life, than any one now-a-days would be for speaking of mesmeric trances, or the affirmed results of homœopathy, although he knew the absurdity and falsehood of both.

These early religious chemists were probably also medical practitioners. Galen, however, was still a standing authority, and few remedies save Galenical ones, i. e., those derived from the vegetable world, were employed. Some chemical drugs were, however, doubtless beginning to be used, and Basil Valentine, a Saxon monk, paved the way, in the fourteenth century, for an innovation in this respect, that had much influence upon chemistry. He introduced antimonials into practice, and is said to have experimented upon his brother monks with them with such bad results, that the metal has been called antimony, or *αντί μόνος* ever since.

But a strange innovation was at hand, and for the first time Pyrrhonism dawned upon the science. The empiric Paracelsus—the Luther of chemistry—appeared. Like Luther, Paracelsus had the desire to attack what was believed, to throw his whole soul and energy into the contest, and after all to merely destroy, and to build up nothing in the place of that which was gone. Paracelsus introduced into chemistry the spirit of scepticism. His first public professional act was to burn publicly the writings of Galen and Avicenna, and, curiously enough, he first commenced the discontinuance of the use of the learned languages in teaching, and substituted the vernacular. His own beard, he said, contained more knowledge than all the universities, and the hairs of his head more than that of all previous physicians. As if to keep up the parallel with Luther, Paracelsus was, although like Luther essentially a Pyrrhonist, excessively superstitious upon many points, and believed, or affected to believe, in the doctrine of signatures, and other fancies as absurd. Paracelsus closed his troubled and vagabond life in 1541.

In one sense Paracelsus inflicted a severe blow upon the science of chemistry, but indirectly, and ultimately, he certainly promoted its progress. To attack what is believed, possibly believed with affection, simply because it is established belief, and the preaching up of empiricism are always dangerous enough, but in this, as in other analogous cases, out of danger comes safety. The superstitious and otherwise absurd doctrines of Paracelsus and his (happily, few) followers, were soon neglected and forgotten, but the faith in the efficacy of mineral or chemical remedies, as they came to be called, in opposition to the Galenical ones, remained, and what was of more importance still, (for a great many mineral drugs might, after all, safely be dispensed with,) chemistry became to be recognized as an essential branch of medical education, and from this time every physician was more or less of a chemist, a procedure that has subsequently brought about very beneficial results.

The purely empirical school of Paracelsus speedily and naturally died. We say *naturally*, for empiricism being the product of an individual, dies with the individual. But chemistry had received such a shock from her encounter with these practical innovations, that the dogmatic school did not at once assume its sway, but methodism again obtained the supremacy. Van Helmont was the founder of this new methodic sect. Born in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, he studied philosophy at Louvain, and there attended the prelections of the Jesuits of that city, but he took no degree. He became next a diligent student of the writings of Thomas à Kempis and of Taulerus, and he endeavoured to draw an analogy between physical science and the operations of divine grace. From a spirit of mortification he surrendered his property to his sister, studied medicine in order that he might be of use to the poor, and endeavoured to build up a system of general material philosophy, including, of course, chemistry.

This system was not that of a rational dogmatist, but essentially methodic, and therefore its details need not detain us long. He assumed the existence of an imaginary principle, which he named the archæus, and which he maintained had some mysterious power of drawing the particles of matter together by means of the process of fermentation. Only two causes of matter, he said, existed,

the cause *per quam*, or the archæus, and the cause *ex qua*, which he maintained was water. Even existing botanical works sometimes quote Van Helmont's experiment with the willow, which he imagined, of course quite erroneously, to obtain its wood, leaves, bark, &c., entirely from that fluid. The archæus he maintained was nearly analogous to the soul, and by the ferment that it produced the particles of water were so variously arranged as to produce every material form and structure. The manner in which Van Helmont explained details by means of his theory need not be here stated, and are only interesting to the scientific antiquarian. He founded, however, the school of iatro-chemistry, among the members of which we may mention our own Willis, the anatomist. This sect, essentially a methodic, and therefore of course a wrong one, held the preposterous notion that all the operations in the living body depended entirely upon non-vital or upon chemical and mechanical properties, and could be explained by and were analogous with the mere properties of dead matter. Nevertheless, for a considerable time all the physicians were more or less iatro-chemists. To this day in medical language, or, at any rate, in popular medical language, many expressions remain that have been clearly derived from this sect.

Properly speaking, it was Booyerhaave, the great medical dogmatist, who put down this methodic school of iatro-chemists, although several movements in this direction had unquestionably been made before the publication of his work upon chemistry. This reform was effected by Booyerhaave, not by rejecting theory, but by returning to the old plan of rational dogmatism. Some of his experiments, as those having reference to the impossibility of fixing mercury, were most elaborate, and extended over a period of fifteen years. Booyerhaave, however, cannot be said to have added anything to chemistry, so much as to have restored it to its orthodox form. Among the members of his school, some of whom, in point of fact, really preceded him, but who did not attain to his authority, may be named Glauber, Lemery, Kunckel, and Geoffroy.

We must now go chronologically backwards. Towards the close of the seventeenth century Mr. Mayow of Oxford expressed his belief that there was a connection between combustion and respiration. He ascertained experimentally that air in a glass, in which a candle had been

burned, could no longer support combustion, and that an animal introduced into it died. Some time afterwards the subject of combustion excited the attention of Stahl, and he and his school founded the famous phlogiston theory. The original founder, indeed, of this very ingenious theory was certainly Beecher, but Stahl so refined upon it that he is entitled to be regarded as its founder. All combustible bodies, he taught, were compound ones, and during combustion one of the constituents was dissipated, while the other remained behind. Thus, when a metal was burnt, and a calx (or oxide) obtained, it was held that the metal, before being burnt, had been a compound, that in the burning it had parted with one of its constituents, (which received the name of phlogiston,) and, farther, that if the phlogiston could be restored to it, (the calx,) the original metal could be obtained. It will be observed that the constituent supposed to be expelled from combustibles during combustion was considered to be the same, namely, phlogiston in all combustibles.

We know now that this theory was not only imperfect but erroneous, but we perhaps do not sufficiently appreciate its beauty and its usefulness. And certainly it accorded exactly with all known chemical facts. For instance, if we take lead and expose it to a red heat, red lead as we call it, or lead calx, as it was called, is formed. Stahl's explanation of this was, that lead was a compound of lead, calx, and phlogiston, and that the latter had been by the heat expelled. If this calx be heated with charcoal, or any other combustible substance, we get metallic lead again. Stahl explained this by saying that the calx had acquired phlogiston from the combustible. We know that lead, when heated, becomes a calx or oxide, by obtaining oxygen from the air, and that the calx becomes a metal again from its oxygen combining with the carbon of the combustible. Our space does not permit us to give other illustrations, but it will be plain from what has been stated, how admirably the phlogiston theory explained an immense number of chemical phenomena.

The error committed by Stahl and his school was in not using the balance. When the lead was heated, if it parted with phlogiston to become a calx, it would of course become lighter, but the fact is the very reverse. On the other hand, if when the calx became metal again, it did so by obtaining phlogiston from the combustible, it would

become heavier, but it actually loses. And, in fact, as we shall immediately have occasion to notice, it was the balance that destroyed the phlogiston theory. The theory, however, did in its time good, was taught by eminent men, and was relinquished whenever disproved. It was a step in rational chemistry.

Our space forbids us to mention any one who kept up the credit of the Stahlian school, save that of Charnier, whose *Elements of Chemistry* was long the standard text book, and the English translation was for long recommended by Dr. Black, who, about a century ago, made a discovery that was the first step in the foundation of the new rational school. It had long been known that when chalk, a solid substance, is heated to redness, it becomes very acid. The explanation given of this was, that the chalk had acquired phlogiston, but Black ascertained that the change was owing to the fixed air, as carbonic acid gas was then called, being driven off. When, to the other alkalies carbonate lime was added, it was thought that the lime communicated causticity, but Black proved most satisfactorily that the real action that took place was, that the lime removed from them the carbonic acid, and which carbonic acid had prevented their properties from being developed. It is impossible to overrate the importance of this new doctrine of chemistry. Continuing his investigations regarding heat, Black developed his theory of latent heat, which certainly has been the parent of the steam engine. Black farther ascertained with regard to carbonic acid, that it would not support either combustion or respiration, that it was formed in the lungs of animals, and was also a product of fermentation.

Before the time of Black chemists had known that aeriform matter was often evolved from substance, but such were always considered to have the composition of air, and indeed to be that fluid. Black had, however, established the existence of fixed air, or carbonic acid. The properties of this were still more fully investigated by Cavendish, who likewise discovered the existence of a third separate gas, inflammable air, or as we now call it, hydrogen. Cavendish, for a very probable reason, the fallacy of which we cannot here enter into, was inclined to regard hydrogen as phlogiston. A little later, Rutherford of Edinburgh discovered the existence of another gas,

nitrogen, or mephitic air, as it was then named. The school of the pneumatic chemists was founded.

The greatest ornament of this school was unquestionably Priestley. His first discovery was that of nitrous acid, or at any rate he first attended to the properties of this gaseous compound, and employed it in the analysis of air. On the 1st August, 1744, he discovered oxygen, or diphlogisticated air, as it was termed. The reason that Priestley adopted this expression was, that he believed in the phlogiston theory, and seeing that the oxygen obtained from the air supported combustion so readily; he inferred that it had been deprived of its phlogiston, and that the cause of its supporting combustion so brilliantly, was owing to its great tendency to combine again with phlogiston. Dr. Priestley likewise first made known sulphurous acid, hydrochloric acid, ammoniacal gas, and other substances, and moreover, he was the first who pointed out that the fixed air, or carbonic acid that was the product either of combustion or respiration, was removed from the atmosphere by plants that actually obtained nutriment from it.

We cannot pass over this school of chemistry without a notice at least of Scheele and Bergmann. The former certainly discovered oxygen quite independently of any knowledge that he had of what Priestley had done, and the Essay on "Elective Attractions" of the latter, was the most successful piece of philosophical generalization of his age. He demonstrated that all bodies that can chemically unite together, have a fixed and definite attraction for one another,—that one substance has various degrees of affinity for various substances, and that even when united to one for which it has a slight affinity, if a substance be presented to it for which it has a stronger affinity, decomposition takes place, and a new compound is formed. This doctrine has been a little modified, but is nevertheless the basis of all inorganic chemical philosophy.

Next came the French school, but their additions to chemical science, as well as those of their successors, demand, and shall obtain a separate review. One observation may here be allowed. The number of chemical facts that have accumulated has been, since the era of Lavoisier, so great, that there is again some little fear of both empiricism and methodism attacking chemistry. It

may seem paradoxical to say it, but perhaps the greatest blessing that could fall on modern chemistry would be, if it did not receive one solitary additional fact for the next dozen years. As too much food, instead of nourishing, produces disease, so the too eager research for, and too rapid recording of facts and detailed observations, produce a morbid state in science. Facts, indeed, only are of use in so far as principles may be deduced from them. And at present chemistry has a great many statements that are not quite certain, and a great lack of the generalization of its clearly established facts. When this is the case, history tells us that there is a great tendency to despise slow and rational deduction, and to fly off into methodical theories, and empirical practices. Chemistry is now perhaps in some danger of both, for much undoubtedly remains to be learned regarding the composition of compound bodies, and perhaps the number of the elementary ones, or so-called elementary ones, to be reduced. In the hands of a Faraday, allotropism will be philosophical, yet, if it fall into the hands of some, it may become merely a representation of the methodic alchemy of the Arabs. Empiricism, too, has of late years made some fierce assaults upon chemistry. The mere laboratorians, who live among retorts and furnaces, and who are dexterous at manipulating, and at repeating often before performed analyses, are becoming very much disposed to consider themselves as the chemical philosophers. The work-people in fact not only despise, but wish to depose their masters, and like the bellows-blower to Handel's organ, affirm that it is they who make the harmony. However, if chemistry has before it some little dangers, it has had many much more serious ere now, and has not only escaped from them, but has carried away spoil, and so doubtless will chemistry do again.

ART. IV.—1. *The Natural History of Creation.* By T. LINDLEY KEMP. London: Longmans, 1852.

2. *Indications of Instinct.* By T. LINDLEY KEMP; being Nos. 24 and 54 of the "Traveller's Library." London: Longmans, 1854.

THESE two little books, by the same author, are popular expositions of not a few topics of the highest interest and importance. Dr. Kemp has successfully studied the art of popular writing on subjects of science. This is no small praise, for the greatest number of our modern popular scientific treatises are composed in a manner not at all level to the apprehension of the parties for whose use such books are intended. Many of these are meagre enough as respects the amount of knowledge which they convey, yet full of details as far as they go. But details, however important, should hold but a secondary place in a popular treatise, while the main attention should be devoted to supplying the reader with ideas, so as to enable him to enter into the spirit of the subject under consideration, and to make way for his easier apprehension of the purpose and bearing of the details. It is true that the English mind, owing to its decidedly practical turn, seeks details, and hardly feels that it is acquiring knowledge while nothing but general views and principles are communicated. And this, doubtless, is the reason why so many treatises which have "popular" printed on the title-page, exhibit so little of a popular character in their interior. The authors indulge the national humour, and fill their books with particulars, but with what result? certainly with no success in spreading through new circles of society the knowledge of the subjects which they have undertaken to teach. Their readers can see that, according to the standard of ample detail, the books are excellent, but they come to the conclusion that such studies are either not suited to the meagreness of their present ideas, or to the stinted leisure which they can command from their habitual avocations. If, then, any great progress is hereafter to be made in imparting to the general public a knowledge of scientific subjects, a change of plan must be made in our popular

treatises—the public taste for the appearance of particulars must not be indulged, but counteracted, while means must be found of reconciling people to the cultivation of general notions, ideas, and principles, in the various branches of scientific research, as preliminary to the attainment of a better facility for the apprehension and remembrance of the particulars of the sciences.

“The Natural History of Creation,” the first of the works at the head of this article, is a duodecimo of 123 pages. It is designed to exhibit the general character of the three great departments of nature, the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal kingdoms, the modes in which these are connected together, and the plan on which the existence of the two organic kingdoms is developed and maintained. The treatise is wholly elementary, and throughout most intelligible. The titles of the two first chapters are, “The living and the dead occupants of the globe,” and “The way the blood is circulated;” those of the two last are, “The way people die,” and “The ways the doctors have of preventing death.”

The second of the two works, namely, “*Indications of Instinct*,” is a duodecimo of 144 pages. Of this we wish to speak a little more fully.

Dr. Kemp gives a large extension to the idea of instinct. He regards instinct as belonging not merely to the higher orders of animals, but as displayed in the acts of the very lowest tribes of the animal kingdom, and even in the vegetable creation. Nevertheless, if we understand our author aright, he limits the operations of instinct to what physiologists term relative acts, that is, to acts by which the organic system establishes direct relations with things without, exclusive of the acts immediately subservient to its own proper development and maintenance. Such relative acts are commonly regarded as peculiar to animals, and were indeed formerly known distinctively as the animal functions, the attributes by which animals are in particular distinguished from vegetables. It is undeniable that the functions, namely, the operations of sense and voluntary motion, by which the higher animals, and man in particular, acquire a knowledge of nature, and a power over it, are essentially the attributes of the animal kingdom; nevertheless, these functions dwindle to a minimum in the lowest tribes of animals, and are replaced in plants by acts which, though manifestly different in their physiolo-

gical character, are yet often strictly analogous in their effects. Thus, when a man gathers dates from a date-palm, he performs an act of relation; he exerts a power over nature; but when these dates, received into his stomach, undergo digestion, and pass into chyme, the act is termed physiologically an organic or vegetative act, and falls under that class of functions which is common to all organic nature, to plants as well as to animals. But to take an example from the work before us. The bean contains a large proportion of alkali, and a small proportion of siliceous earth, while barley contains a large proportion of a siliceous earth, and a small proportion of alkali, and the roots of these two plants spread out in the same field till each has obtained the requisite quantity of these two elements. It is true the acts in these contrasted instances of the animal and vegetable kingdom differ essentially in the organization by which they are severally effected, but in their general result there is a strict analogy, so that it does not seem unreasonable to admit this extension of the radicles of such plants as the bean and barley to the rank of relative functions.

When, then, our author admits certain operations of plants to the rank of instincts, it is to be understood that such operations uniformly bear a strict analogy to what are termed the relative acts of animals. He does not, in short, destroy the use of the term instinct, as some have done, not without plausible reasons, when they have considered all the operations of organic nature as bearing one character of instinctive acts—speaking even of the chemical phenomena exhibited in the development and repair of living structures as the results of instinctive affinities. In such an excessive extension of the term instinct, it becomes confounded with the operations of vitality. We admit, however, that such a view has a foundation in the strict analogy which exists between the results produced by the operations of the molecular constituents of the solids and fluids of living nature, so strongly suggestive of the direct presence of an intelligent agency, and those wonderful performances determined in animals by that inward impulse to which ordinarily the name of instinct is applied.

Among the instances of instinct in plants, Dr. Kemp enumerates the opening and shutting of flowers; the movements of the stamens in certain flowers, by which the

pollen is communicated to the stigma, the change in the direction of the leaves in many plants, as in what is termed the sleep of plants, one of the ordinary effects of which is, to conceal and protect the flowers; also the singular effects witnessed in the *Dionæa muscipula*, or Venus' fly-trap, in the several species of *Drosera*, or sun-dew; the species of *Oscillatoria* among the jointed algæ, the phenomena of climbing plants, and the acts already referred to by which many plants extend their radicles along the adjacent soil till the proper kind of food is attained. Viewed as relative acts, that is, as acts falling under the same head as the acts of knowledge and power exemplified in the higher animals, such phenomena have plainly a rudimentary character; still, they are more allied to relative phenomena than to those direct acts of assimilation, which, under the guidance of a vital chemistry, are performed in the ultimate cells of the vegetable texture. Hence, if all the functions of organic nature, both vegetable and animal, be exhausted under the three heads, vegetative, reproductive, and relative, the above enumerated phenomena of the vegetable kingdom must necessarily fall under the head of relative phenomena, and, therefore, claim a place under instinct as justly as any analogous phenomena in the animal kingdom. They are acts of a rudimentary relative character, essential to some required use in the economy of the plants which exhibit them, and determined by the presence or by the more or less frequent recurrence of an adequate stimulant agency.

Among the instances of instinct referred to by our author in the lowest tribes of animals, are the following:—Some of the infusories, animals so minute that hundreds of thousands of them may exist in a single drop of water, rotate the bristles or tenacles around their mouths, by which a current of water, containing their food, is determined into their mouths; polypes fix themselves to rocks less exposed to violent currents, and apparently, if there be a deficiency of light in their first place of abode, they move towards a lighter place of abode, and when they seize their food, they put out no more of their long arms than is necessary to overpower their present prey; the coral polypes, after having reared an island above the surface of the sea, with a lake in its centre, leave a communication between this lake and the sea, by which a due supply of food and building materials may enter; the sea-

anemones present at times the appearance of expanded flowers, fixed to rocks at the bottom of the sea, and when all is quiet these apparent flowers come up to the surface, but on the slightest indication of danger, instantly descend, and nothing is there to be seen but a fleshy mass, sticking so fast to the rocky bottom, that it cannot be removed without tearing its structure to pieces; the young salpes, whose structure is frail, like that of a thin jelly, unite themselves together for mutual protection, by means of lateral suckers, and when after a time a greater stability of structure is attained, the instinct of association ceases, and the several individuals separate; these salpes being the lowest animals in point of organization, which possess the instinct of association for mutual support; the pholads, or stone-borers, little animals living in a fragile bivalve shell, bore a hole after a definite plan, in the hard rock, which may serve them for a habitation; among the bivalve shells, such as the oyster, the clam, and those of the genus *venus* to which the wampum belongs, singular instincts are observed, as for example, that by which the oyster, by suddenly squirting out water, throws its enemy, the crab, on its back, and those by which some of the others use one of their shells as a sail, when at the surface, in a gentle breeze; the remarkably complex movements, by which the common garden snail prepares in autumn for hibernation, the chief object of which is, to provide a supply of air for its respiration during the time occupied, on the return of spring, in working itself out of its winter prison; the condylope, termed the pest of the perch, the hermit-crab, the genus crab in general, and the spider tribe, with their generally known singular instinctive habits, conclude this interesting chapter.

The next chapter is devoted to the instinct of insects, in which much attractive matter is added, to what is so generally known on this subject, the singular habits of ants and bees affording the principal themes of the chapter.

In the next chapter, on the instinct of fishes and reptiles, many curious facts are related. Among others we find a notice of the fish termed the fly-shooter, which the Chinese often keep for amusement in their houses, the singularity in its habits being the accuracy with which it darts a drop of water at such insects as come within reach, so as to kill or stun them for prey. Again, a notice of the

fishing-frog, which conceals itself in the sea-weeds, while the filaments fringing its body float and move about like worms, so as to attract fishes, which are immediately swallowed by the greedy monster.

The chapter on the instincts of birds is short—along, however, with other interesting matter, it contains an account of the singular instinct of the young cuckoo, by which it ejects the young of the bird, into the nest of which, when still an egg, it had been dropped by the equally striking instinct of its parent,—the remarkable adaptation in the form of the young cuckoo for this instinctive piece of injustice, as first pointed out to the Royal Society by the illustrious Jenner, is not omitted.

In the chapter on the instincts of mammals, our author points out how much less forcible is the impulse in these towards such acts than in the lower animals, as evinced by the comparative facility with which the instinctive habits of mammals are changed and counteracted by circumstances.

A chapter follows on the reasoning powers of animals. Under this head our author gives as an example of reasoning power in animals, not very high in the scale, a statement as to the black ants of India, made by Colonel Sykes. To protect his dessert, consisting of fruit, cake, and preserves, from these ants, the legs of the table, on which it stood before it was required, were first placed in pails of water—this was effectual for a time, but ere long the ants braved the water, plunging in, and scrambling to one of the legs of the table,—the legs of the table were now painted with a circle of turpentine, which, it appears they could not cross: nevertheless, in a few days it was found that they had gained access to the table in as great numbers as before, which feat they had accomplished by creeping up the wall, so as to reach the ceiling immediately over the table, and then dropping down on the dainties they so much coveted. This last expedient Dr. Kemp regards as decidedly the result of a process of reasoning.

Our author at last comes to discourse of man, and here we shall allow him to speak for himself.

“Man is indeed devoid of instincts; and his reason, if indeed it be of the same nature as that of the higher beasts, is as superior in its results as the instinct of the bee is to the instinctive

turning of the plant to light. But, besides his corporal connexion, and his exalted power of reasoning upon external objects, he has something additional. When external objects are presented to his senses, he does not instinctively act in some particular manner as the beasts do; but he observes and reflects, and acts in accordance to the decision of his mind. But although his physical actions are under the control of his intellect, some of his mental operations are of a nature analogous to the corporeal instincts of animals. As when the first ray of light discloses to the young water-bird, or the young crocodile, the water, each of these makes for that element; so, when certain propositions—propositions, too, that have no connection with matter—are made to man, his mind or spiritual part at once believes them, and adopts them as part of its own being.”—p. 138.

To this quotation we shall add the concluding paragraph of the work, which, in a few words, shows the scope and tendency of the argument throughout both these excellent little books.

“This, then, is the argument. Ages ago it pleased an all-powerful Being to call into existence this matter that is cognizable by our senses. What endowments He at first conferred upon it, it is impossible to discover; but at one period He made it subject to the laws of gravitation, to which laws a great portion of it is still liable. Subsequently, He bestowed upon the different elements of it those extraordinary chemical affinities which, after a study of nature for two thousand years, man is now beginning to discern, and which chemical affinities still regulate the greater part of the unions which yet occur. After this, it would seem to have been part of His will to make various portions of matter unite, so as to form organized beings, subject to the laws of vitality and instinct. When we come to the higher of these we behold the operation of a new element—reason, which is supplementary to instinct in producing and causing motion. Then, leaving the animals, we come to a new being, man, connected in some mysterious manner with matter, but who is not under the control of instinct, but of reason, not only physical movements, but mental abstractions; and who, moreover, instinctively believes, when told, in God and another state of being. And as we see in merely vitalized beings, that the instinctive desire to attain an end invariably concludes in that end being attained, so also, the instinctive beliefs of man will unquestionably be realised. That this will be so, may be learned from another and a higher source, but still it is the legitimate deduction from the study of that physical science which is so often thought to oppose revelation, and is from time to time set up to oppose it. And thus it is that from apparent darkness proceeds light, that faith springs out of doubt, and that, to use the words of the old Hebrew warrior, ‘out of the eater there came forth meat.’—pp. 143-144.

ART. V.—*The Druses of the Lebanon. Their Manners, Customs, and History.* With a translation of their Religious Code. By GEORGE WASHINGTON CHASSEAUD, late of Beyrout, Syria. London: Bentley, 1855.

A VOLUME realizing the promise of such a title would command no vulgar interest, especially from a writer whose opportunities of observation and study were so considerable as those which appear to have been enjoyed by Mr. Chasseaud. But we are sorry that we cannot say that M. Chasseaud has been equal to his opportunities. He has undoubtedly given us a certain insight into the customs of those extraordinary tribes, and some of his pictures are not altogether wanting in colour and animation; his version, too, of their religious and moral system is sufficiently interesting, but the two or three dozen pages which he devotes to their history, are a bad title on which to found a claim to be called a historian of the Druses. In truth, his pretensions are more modest in the text than in the title; for in the former he claims only to have given "a brief historical sketch;" but unless the responsibility of the title can be shifted upon the publishers, the author has sent out his book in a character which it cannot sustain. The sketch, such as it is, while it deals chiefly with matters of secondary interest, and touches upon the many theories that perplex our inquiry into the origin of the Druses; scarcely at all notices the struggles between them and the Maronites, which have contributed more, perhaps, to make them known to Europe, than any other occurrence in their history, worthy as that history is of being studied for the singular characteristics of religion and government it discloses, and the curious theories involved in its origin.

The most hopeful feature, as it occurs to us, in Mr. Chasseaud's book, is the youthfulness of the style, from which we are inclined to infer, though perhaps without sufficient warrant, the youth of the author. If we are right in supposing him to be of unripe years, a good many of his faults of style will be accounted for; and, as a specimen of precocity, the book may be considered fair enough.

Time, reading, and experience, have an irresistible tendency to confine a man to statements of fact, and prune down his redundant imagination. To borrow our author's style, this faculty of his, as might be expected, runs riot most freely in the field of description. In mere narrative he is more staid, natural, and it need scarcely be added, far more pleasing; although even there we meet with somewhat startling juvenilities. A Druse peasant, for instance, is made to give the history of his courtship, and cannot get through it without telling us that "the course of true love never did run smooth," an evidence of familiarity with English literature, that must be rare, to say the least of it, among the Druses. There are, nevertheless, a good many interesting, and, we have no doubt, faithful pictures of Druse life and manners in the book, and had its title been less pretentious, these imperfections of style, to which we have thought it necessary to allude, would not have been so conspicuous.

Beyond a few opinions modestly ventured as to the descent of the Druses from the ancient Hivites, and some snatches of their modern annals, there is not much information of an historical kind to be derived from the volume. As we before observed, their struggle with the Maronites is only once or twice noticed, and that incidentally; but who the Maronites are we are left to our own research to discover. With regard to the peculiar doctrines, however, of the Druses, doctrines so very different from any professed elsewhere, we have not so much reason to complain. They are noticed in the course of the sketches: and the Appendix, from which we propose to make an extract or two, contains what purports to be the exact system both of belief and morals adopted by the Druses. Eccentric as this symbol may appear, and crowded as it is with absurdities, a closer inspection will show that its principal features, though at present to be found only amongst the Druses, were by no means confined to these tribes, or even originated by them. They are extinct monsters of imagination for the bulk of mankind, but they had, even amongst men claiming to be Christians, as real an existence as the *Megalosaurus* had in the material world. In a word, the creed or the mysteries of the Druses are plainly an offshoot of the ancient Gnosticism, and the result of a precisely similar grafting of eastern myths, and what has been called eastern philosophy, upon the truths

of Revelation. This will appear with sufficient clearness when we come to place the matters of comparison in juxtaposition; and a little inquiry will enable us, moreover, to ascertain with tolerable accuracy the period when the Druse doctrines began to grow into their present shape, though we cannot pretend to carry our speculation so far back as the patriarchal times.

We believe it will be found that the history proper of the Druses begins about the period of the Mahometan Schism between the literal and figurative expounders of the Koran. Their history, as a distinct nationality, commences at that epoch, because it is just then we meet with the originators of their religious system. It is hardly necessary to say they began with the figurative interpretation of the Koran, for, grotesque as is the compilation of that celebrated book, its letter could never lend itself even remotely to a construction resembling the creed of the Druses. Their doctrines, in a crude state of course, were first made public in Cairo, by two leaders of the figurative school, Mahommed, son of Ismael, surnamed Darusi, and Hamsa, son of Ali, surnamed Al Hadi, or the leader. It was not to be supposed that opinions like theirs could establish themselves without opposition, or indeed, establish themselves at all in a large community; and accordingly we find the coryphæi of the new doctrines obliged to escape from Cairo, and take refuge in the mountains. They had, however, made some proselytes, and one in particular, of great importance—Hakem, formerly the caliph of the family of Ali. They taught him that he was no less a personage than the incarnation of the Deity, and freely applied to him all the epithets that in the Koran are applied to God alone. Whether he allowed his head to be turned by their adulation, or simply lent himself to the imposture, certain it is, a total change was wrought in his character. From being a zealous upholder of the law, and a stern persecutor of Jews and Christians, he threw the law overboard, and allowed the infidels to live unmolested. When Hampsas was obliged to withdraw from Cairo, and seek in the Lebanon that hospitality which is probably of earlier date than the religion of the Druses, Hakem supplied him with money, which Hampsas paid back in incense, and published his mysteries from the unapproachable secrecy and security of the mountains. This was quite a congenial spot for the growth of gnosticism in any

of its varieties. Basilides was anxious in his own day to establish the five years' probationary silence of Pythagoras; though, indeed, the gnostics have not been peculiar in affecting secrecy and mystery, at least until their extravagancies were ripe for publicity. It was the same with the Albigenses, who, however, were a slip of the parent stock, and later still, with the first Jansenists, whose well-known motto was, "*occulte propter metum Judæorum.*" But the apotheosis of Hakem could not be complete before his death; for it was hard to persuade men that another living and moving man, with whom they were in daily intercourse, was a mere phantasm, as they declared Hakem to be; a farther point of similarity between them, and we believe, all varieties of Gnostics, who believed that the Redeemer never was born, and never suffered in the flesh; but that he was a mere manifestation of the Deity to corporeal eyes, having no real or substantial existence. The appearance of Hakem, in the year 375, of the Hegyra and his enthronization in 386, were, as Hampsa taught, after the death of Hakem, mere visions for the purpose of giving men some idea of the Creator. Regarding God himself, it was held that He could not be described by attributes—you were forbidden to compare Him with anything earthly, and it was equally unlawful to speak of Him in the negative. The spirits immediately next in rank to God were five, Mind, Soul, Word, Precursor, and Follower. The five were parts of a whole, just as in the taper the wax, wick, flame, and stand, constitute the entire. The flame, Hampsa added, is at first of a bluish red, soon seen, and soon disappearing—symbolical of Hampsa himself, who, though he assigned to Hakem the first place in his system, seems to have reserved the most important one for his own especial gratification. Accordingly, it is from the incarnation of "*Mind,*" in Hampsa, rather than from any of the events in the life of Hakem that the Druse epoch dates. He is styled the first cause of causes, the unique teacher who instructs the whole world,—who exalts and humbles all the other ranks of spirits,—the hand of time, the one possessor of argument,—nay, the title of Allah itself is not withheld from him.

This body of doctrine with a moral code not altogether so absurd, is committed to the charge of certain ministers called Akals, the precise nature of whose functions, or anything beyond their great influence over the people, it is not

easy to determine. Most probably the isolation of the Druses in religion, as well as their mountain fastnesses, contributed to secure their independence for so many centuries, as the same causes secured that of their neighbours, the Maronites, for a period almost equally long: and both these nations, though so different in religious profession, and both so warlike, lived in wonderfully good intelligence, and often brotherhood in arms, until Europe and Asia conspired to embroil them, and gave rise to scenes of blood and desolation such as even Palestine has rarely witnessed.

The Maronites, whose name and origin as a religious body appears involved in almost as great obscurity as that of the Druses, ought to command a relative interest at least, in any historian of the latter, or even in any one writing a book about them. We of course feel no ordinary interest in one of the few oriental churches of our own communion. We could gladly discuss the rival theories regarding their early errors and the time of their final reunion with the Roman Church, were they our peculiar concern at this moment; but this much is certain, that whatever may have been their errors at a remote period, their union with the Church at the present day is so complete and intimate, that learned Maronites, with pardonable zeal for the good name of their ancestors, have ingeniously laboured to prove that there was no real difference of opinion between Rome and the Maronites in matters of doctrine. And it struck us as something very strange, that Mr. Chasseaud was so destitute of even the ordinary inquisitiveness of Englishmen, as not to discover in his visit to the convent of Daer al Shafi that it is the residence of a Patriarch of Antioch, who has seventeen suffragans in the Lebanon, who takes the name of Peter, is in communion with Rome, and governs a Church so interestingly primitive in ritual, discipline, and observances, though perhaps a Protestant might not be willing to allow it primitive belief.

We extract a rather pleasing description of the preliminaries to a Druse marriage.

“When these preliminaries have been arranged, then three days before the time fixed for the celebration of the wedding, the young man assembles together all the youths of the village, and picking out of these the finest and handsomest looking men, makes them

arm themselves cap-à-pie, and himself a perfect armoury of warlike weapons, heading them, he proceeds in a regular procession to the house of the father of his future bride, who, on his side having duly received intimation of the fact, arms himself and his household also, and stands at the threshold of the door to receive him, demanding in words similar to Scott's celebrated song—

‘Oh come ye in peace here or come ye in war,
Or to dance at our bridal young Lord Lochnivar?’

Here, in presence of the assembled villagers, and after loud discussion, the final articles of the marriage are settled and agreed to; the bride's father who possesses some portion of that love of gain inherent amongst Eastern nations, usually adds a few piastres or a sheep or two to what was originally contemplated in the valuation of the bride.

“But the young man who is impatient to obtain the final consent, and who, moreover, remembers that ‘nunkey pays for me,’ that his father will bear the cost of expenses, usually agrees to the compact; it is then agreed as a secondary matter of consideration what dowry is to be settled by the young man upon the bride herself; but this is merely a fictitious arrangement, for such a thing as pin-money is unknown amongst Druse married ladies.

“This point adjusted, the young man solemnly declares, and promises to the family to protect and love his future wife; then the betrothed girl, veiled from head to foot and accompanied by her nearest female relations, is brought to the door, and her lover asks her in a distinct voice, that all-important question which settles the destinies of so many poor mortals upon earth. As a matter of course the girl replies in the affirmative, but at the same time she presents him in token of her future obedience with a dagger carefully drawn up in a woollen scarf of her own manufacture, and which she has many days, nay, years, previously knitted; inch by inch, as she pictured up in her childish imagination the realisation of this happy hour when the bold lover should come to ask her for this token. It is to be hoped that the husband may never have occasion to unrip the threads which conceal this sharp-edged tool from sight, for among the Druses it is supposed that he will only resort to it in order to protect his wife from some murderous assault, or to satiate the hateful passion of jealousy. * * *

“At last the auspicious morning for the celebration of the marriage arrives. Stout preparations are early on foot at the house of the bridegroom; women are busy washing up and scrubbing the floor, and arranging mats, cushions, etc., against the reception of the expected guests, and those guests are supposed to consist of all and every one who may choose to present themselves to partake of the hospitality or join in the revelry, it being always understood that these people do make their appearance in their

best holiday attire, and this seems to have been a custom prevalent ever since the days of our Saviour, all over the Holy Land and Syria. As in the parable the guest who presented himself at the wedding feast without a wedding garment was instantly cast out and expelled, so at the present day it would be looked upon and resented as an insult if any labourer made his appearance without donning his best holiday attire.

"Then, again, in apt illustration of another parable, it is still the duty of the Lord of the feast to assign to those who honour him with their presence, a position in his house, or a seat in his divan, according to their respective claims to consideration. Thus in the outer courts are invariably to be encountered the poorer classes of inhabitants, all served with equal liberality and profusion, but none permitted to enter into the precincts of the house itself, unless it be on servile errands; while in the interior, those admissible to distinction are ranged with particular care and precision along the room, the most honourable guests being seated at the top, and near the master of the house himself, and those of least pretension nearest to the door of entry."—Pp. 148—153.

The following description of the order of Akals is not a little flattering to those "holy persons," as Mr. Chasseaud appears to consider them. We believe there must be a certain amount of truth in it, and we hope for their sakes the truth is the predominating element.

"The class of Akals is not necessarily restricted to the male population; women are often admitted, provided they are of a certain age, and are prepared to submit themselves to the same system of self-denial which characterises the men. The following is the course of proceeding which is adopted when a person is desirous of joining the order. A necessary preliminary is, the person who is a candidate for the honour of admission into the sacred corps, should intimate his intention to an Akal, upon which a meeting is held. This is a very solemn affair, and the ordeal one of the strictest imaginable. An enquiry takes place into the general character and conduct of the aspirant—his whole life is passed in review, his habits criticised, and everything that is known respecting him fully discussed.

"Supposing him not to be guilty of any crime, and to be well recommended, the next step is that he should be made acquainted with the requisitions of the Druse religion, which are then set before him, and he is informed that in order to be worthy of becoming an Akal, he must forthwith abandon every vice, and relinquish all the idle habits he may hitherto have indulged in. He must not smoke nor drink wine nor spirits; neither must he take snuff; he must be content to wear the plainest apparel (this was perhaps aimed at the fairer portion of Akal society), and in short, laying aside every thought of splendour and luxury, must only consider how he can

best show in his demeanour and life, a firm devotion to the simple habits and sacred principles of the order of which he now desires to become an adopted member.

"But this is not enough: the capability to lead a holy life is not always equal to the desire. A temporary excitement of religious tendencies, a more than ordinary warmth of imagination, a sudden calamity may for a time awaken the stings of conscience, and affect the tenderest sensibilities of the heart, but the good impressions too often yield before the force of temptation, and the dormant energies which have been roused for the moment, sink back into their wonted lethargy, or a zeal untempered by knowledge proves that we have undertaken a burthen too heavy to bear, and that we had better not have put our hand to the plough if we cannot forbear to look back.

"The wise Akals, therefore, are not satisfied with the test of promises, they require a little proof, and to this end they allow the candidate for admission into their ranks a certain fixed period, varying in duration according to the man's previous life, before the lapse of which he is expected to have made up his mind fully as to his capability of conforming faithfully for the rest of his life to the tenets of so strict and severe a profession. During this period of probation, all his actions and pursuits are closely watched, and scrupulously noted; and should he at the end of this allotted term still evince a desire to become an Akal, he is then admitted into the Kaloue, and suffered to attend some of their religious meetings and listen to an exposition of their creed and doctrines. Twelve months are now devoted to his religious education, at the end of which he is considered sufficiently tried and instructed to assume the title of Akal. Then the ceremony of donning the white turban takes place, for by this white turban the Akals are recognised, and he is thereupon admitted into all the mysteries of the faith, and becomes one of the initiated brethren.

"Although almost all of what are commonly called the pleasures of life are denied to these holy men, yet celibacy is not enjoined upon the sect. An Akal may marry if he pleases, but it is not often that he does so, especially among the Druses. The Akals of that tribe are, generally speaking, anxious to detach themselves as much as possible from the ordinary pursuits of mankind, they lead a life of the strictest devotion, passed in prayer and profound contemplation of the mysteries of religion, and are held in the highest respect and esteem for their amiable manners and virtuous lives by the whole of the people.

"They exercise, too, a very considerable influence in temporal matters, for nobody would think of entering upon any plan, or conducting an affair without consulting the Akals; nothing of importance could be attempted, even by a Sheik, without their advice and approval; and altogether they exercise a general controul and supervision over the manners and morals of the Druse people,

which has a most beneficial effect, for certainly as the Akals are the best of Druses, so the Druses are the best of the inhabitants of Lebanon.

"The Akals are more especially regarded as the ministers of peace; their very presence banishes discord, and whenever a Druse peasant meets an Akal, he salutes him as one who is the harbinger of peace and happiness, and kisses his hand with reverence and affection.

"The Akals are very jealous of their Khaloues, and no European or stranger is suffered to enter them during the hour of prayer; but at any other time they may be entered by any other sect, upon obtaining the permission of an Akal, although there is little to reward curiosity in the Khaloues, for they are very plain buildings. The walls of some of them are ornamented with different colours, and a rush mat and basin of running water are always to be found in them; the battle flags of the tribe are also hung up there.

"As the Akals are so highly revered during life, all honour is paid to them when death summons them to another world. Upon the occasion of an Akal's funeral, the whole village turns out and accompanies the body to the grave, and the last rites are performed with greater honours than are usually paid even at the funeral of a Sheik. Sums of money, pieces of cloth, and numerous presents, are often given by the villagers to be deposited in the grave or vault of the deceased Akal, and all the virtues and good actions which have distinguished him in life are inscribed on his tomb with affectionate fidelity."—Pp. 376—380.

We now come to the portion of Mr. Chasseaud's book which has been most satisfactory to us, and it is, of all others, the appendix. It contains an epitome of the mythology and morality of the Druses from native sources, being a translation of their symbol, and give evidence of that strong family likeness to the other monsters of Gnosticism which we already noticed. We shall find in these extracts the doctrine of a good and evil principle—of the world being, if not the creation of the evil spirit, at least a consequence of his existence, of its having been enacted by an inferior agency—of the unreality of the appearance and removal of Hakem, for which, in the gnostic doctrine we may substitute Christ—the transmigration of souls—the blending of the Gospel with Eastern fable and mysticism, and numerous other features common to the Druse and gnostic systems.

We need only instance a few of the extravagances of Basilides to establish at once the relationship between the Druse mysteries and his. The Father, he says, is the

origin of all things--He it was who created *Nous* or the intelligence, who in his turn produced *Λογος*, the parent of *Φρονησις*, or prudence, whose offspring was *Σοφια*, or wisdom, which last begat *Δυναμις*, or power, the Father of virtues, princes and angels, together constituting the first heaven, succeeded by other heavens, to the number of three hundred and sixty-five. The god of Jews, according to him, was a spirit of the lowest rank, and when *Nous* was dispatched by the Father in the person of Christ, it was not He that suffered crucifixion, but Simon of Cyrene. In some instances, as will be seen, the Druse doctrines are an exact copy of those of Basilides, but it seems to us made grosser and more carnal to meet the comprehension of the mountaineers.

“ A SHORT EXPLANATION OF THE OCEAN OF TIME.

“The Creator, the supreme, created all things.

“The first thing he created was the minister, ‘Universal Mind,’ the praises of God be upon him! and the Creator gave to ‘Mind’ the power to create, classify, and arrange all things.

“The Spirit, Mind, has the following attributes:—‘The Virgin of Power,’ ‘the Receiver of Revelation,’ ‘the knower of the wishes or desires,’ ‘the Explainer of Commands,’ ‘the Spring of Light,’ ‘the Will of Production,’ ‘the Charm of the Creator,’ and so forth.

“It was this spirit, ‘Mind,’ known by the above attributes, that arranged the world.

“The Mind is the pen that writes upon Stone, and the Stone which it writes upon is the ‘Soul.’

“The Mind is a perfect being, which being is at liberty to act, and is possessed of a free will; all he ordains or creates is in accordance with the will of the Creator.

“When the Creator created ‘Mind,’ he made him possessed of a free will, and with power to separate or to remain and dwell with the Creator.

“Ultimately, ‘Mind’ rebelled and abandoned the Creator, and thus became the Spirit of Sin, which sin was predestined to create the Devil.

“And the existence, or creation of the Devil, occasioned the creation of another spirit, called ‘Universal Soul,’ and this Spirit was the cause of the Creation of all things existing.

“The Devil is perfect sin, and the Creation of this Spirit was permitted by the Creator, to show the unlimited power of the Creator in creating a Spirit opposite to God.

“Now, when mind rebelled against the Creator, the Creator threw him out of Heaven, but mind knew that this was done by

the Creator to test his faith, and to punish him for his sin ; so he repented, and asked forgiveness, and implored help against the devil.

" And the Creator pitied mind, and created him a helpmate, called universal soul ; this spirit God created from the spirits of the knowledge of good and evil.

" Then, 'Mind' told 'Soul' to yield obedience to the Creator, and 'Soul' yielded, and became a helpmate to 'Mind,' and then these two spirits tried to force into submission to the 'Creator,' the evil spirit, or Devil.

" They came to the Evil one, 'Mind' from behind, and 'Soul' from before, in this fashion, to marshal the devil into the presence of the Creator ; but the Devil evaded them, being unguarded on either side, which enabled him to escape from them to the right and left.

" The 'Mind' and 'Soul' finding this to be the case, required each of them a helpmate ; 'Mind' required a helpmate to keep the Evil one from the right side, 'Soul' one to guard him on the left, so as to hem in the devil between them, and prevent his escape on any side.

" So they moved, and immediately two spirits were created ; the one was called 'Word,' and the other 'Preceding.'"—pp. 389, 393.

Then follows a succession of those singular creations, good and evil, on the Manichæan system of opposites, the Devil, however, proves an overmatch for mind and soul, and their assistants, who, though providing for his safe custody, before, behind, and on both sides, have left him an issue upwards and downwards. The upward course gives him no escape, as bringing him to the very presence he was anxious to avoid, so he dropped downwards, or sunk into the earth, and this was the origin of hell. We next have a psychological theory, embodying the Gnostic and Pythagorean theory of the transmigration.

" When the world was created, it was at the will of the Creator, who called it the World of Souls, and these souls are masculine or feminine.

" All the Spirits were created from or out of 'Mind.'

" The origin and root of these Spirits is the Creator ; next to him ranks 'Mind,' then 'Soul,' and so on in regular succession, as they were created, down to ultimum. The Souls that have been created in the world, *that is, Mankind*, were numbered from the beginning, and were never diminished or increased, and will remain so for all eternity.

" Each Soul is perfect in itself, possessing all the senses, such as hearing, feeling, seeing, tasting, smelling, and touching, and pos-

possessing all the attributes and senses which originated by the regular successive creation of the first seven spirits, and each Spirit created possessed, in addition to its own peculiar attributes, the capacities and senses of all the others.

"All the Souls that were created in the world possessed the knowledge of all things except of the Creator, for which cause the Creator placed them in separate bodies, (*earthly tabernacles,*) and by this means they obtained knowledge of their Creator.

* * * * *

"The bodies, or encasements of these Souls, are all corruptible, but the souls themselves are incorruptible and unchangeable, shifting from one man, or beast, to another, and never differing from what they were and continue to be."

Next succeeds a cosmogony, which, though singular enough, yet partly from its allegorical style, not unlike that of Hesiod's *Theogoneia*, has not the same freshness of absurdity discoverable in the greater part of the system, "if shape that may be called which shape has none." Indeed, it is hardly more extravagant than, if stripped of its figurative dress, the most sober theories of ancient philosophers on the same subject. We have it, however, amply made up to us in a passage which, taken in conjunction with the pretensions of the Chinese reformer, afford a rather curious specimen of private interpretation of the Scripture.

"Abi Zacharias sent Karoon to the country of the Yeman, and surnamed him the Muhdi, (director,) and Karoon understood the secrets of the four books, viz., 'the Psalms, the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Koran,' and his faith was promulgated all over the earth.

"And his faith was in the place of one whole day of the three days mentioned in the Gospel on the preaching of Jesus, who said to the people, '*Destroy this temple, and I will raise it after three days.*'

"And it was meant by the three days that the faith of Jesus should last half a day, from twelve o'clock to the evening, and the faith of Soliman, the Persian, from the time of the appearing of the comforter, who is Mohamud, was to last one entire day; and the faith of Karoon also one entire day; and the faith of Kaem el Muntazar Hamsa ebn Ali, at the time of his manifestation, half a day, from morning to noon.

"In the preaching of the Lord, the Messiah, no manifestation takes place, for Jesus said unto the people, 'My time is not con-

summed ; after me will appear a director, who is prevented from coming at this time.'

"And the Creator, [may he be praised !] manifested himself corporeally in the time of the fourth Heaven, in Abdalla ebn Hamed, under the name of Ali ; he is the exalted over all exalted, unto whom belongeth the right of command."—p. 411.

We should apologize for the length of these extracts, but it was difficult to attempt anything like a close abstract of doctrines, which have no system or coherence, and cannot be at all fairly judged but from the sample. The probability is, the mass of the Druses understand little or nothing of this secret learning, the knowledge of which is the chief title of the Akals to the veneration of the multitude ; and it is unquestionably a strange thing to find, living and vigorous, the identical heresies that beset the cradle of Christianity, that were refuted by apostle and evangelist, and have been long thought to be extinct. They do not, to be sure, put forward their ancient claim to be a part of Christianity, if not its essence ; but there they are, distinct and unmistakeable. It would not be easy to take up the broken links between the last of the Gnostics and the first of the Druses, and perhaps it might be matter for speculation whether any tradition of Gnosticism descended to the latter, or whether their profession, like the Gnostic heresies, was not the result of a renewed though isolated effort to connect the truths of revelation with philosophy and fable. It is, at all events, a curious phenomenon, and worth investigation by those whose leisure and course of reading would enable them to prosecute it with advantage ; and, taken in all its relations, the history of the Druses, their manners, customs, and religion, could not fail of being an instructive and engaging study. We thought it incumbent upon us in candour to notice what we considered imperfections and short-comings, in the execution of the task which, to judge from the title of his book, Mr. Chasseaud had imposed upon himself ; but taken simply as a contribution to our small stock of knowledge regarding a people so interesting and so little known, we have reason to feel indebted to him for the book upon our table. At the present moment, as he has remarked, everything connected with the East has an importance and interest which cannot always be counted

upon; but we do not see that in relation to the struggle going on there is any peculiar interest attaching to the Druses. They appear to be the special favourites of Mr. Chasseaud, to the exclusion of the other inhabitants of Lebanon. We have our own preferences, but have no right to quarrel with his, and if they make him a diligent and careful explorer, an accurate and faithful historian, so much the better for him and for the public. It is to be hoped our author has only taken the initiative in this matter, and that he will be followed by others, or take up the matter himself at a later period, bettered by experience and study.

Birth and residence in a country, though not to be overlooked in any one who undertakes to write its history, are not of that primary importance that the author would seem to imagine, and although they may secure faith for what he does write, they will neither make his manner of writing pass current, nor obtain indulgence for his omissions. There were a good many things entitled to commendation, as well as open to criticism, which we should gladly have noticed, but we are obliged to close for the present, too early, indeed, for the merit of the work, or the interest of the subject. We are willing to hope, however, that the labours of future investigators in the same field, which, in truth, is scarcely broken, may occasion a resumption of our own task, and we entertain no doubt that any work including a history of the conflict which began in 1841, between the Druses and Maronites, would of necessity record incidents as striking and dramatic, episodes as moving, achievements as daring, and horrors as atrocious, as any in the annals of mountain warfare.

ART. VI.—(1.) *The Chinese Empire*; forming a Sequel to the Work entitled, “*Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet.*” By M. Huc, formerly Missionary Apostolic in China. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Longmans, 1855.

(2.) *History of the Insurrection in China; with Notices of the Christianity, Creed, and Proclamations of the Insurgents.* By MM. CALLERY and IVAN. 8vo. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1853.

(3.) *Discoveries in Chinese; or the Symbolism of the Primitive Characters of the Chinese System of Writing.* By STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS. 8vo. New York: Norton, 1854.

THE historian of Lord Macartney's embassy to China confesses, that “they entered Peking like beggars, stayed in it like prisoners, and were driven out of it like thieves.” If the truth were fairly told, such has been the normal condition of modern travellers in China. Even the so-called “opening” of the Celestial Empire has afforded marvellously small opportunity for observation: and there needs but little scrutiny, if any, of the rapid and superficial narratives to which it has given occasion, in order to discover that if the writers tell but little, it is simply because they themselves have seen even less than what they relate.

As regards the open ports, it is true, the facilities of observation have been very materially enlarged since the termination of the war. But it would be a great fallacy to receive a description of the half-europeanized society of these mere dépôts of commerce, as a complete, or generally faithful picture of the social condition of the three hundred and sixty millions which jostle each other throughout the countless cities, towns, villages, lakes, rivers, and canals of this overgrown and over-peopled empire. And, for the rest of China, the real facilities of travelling; the opportunities of seeing the country, of examining its institutions and becoming familiar with its usages; the means, in a word, of obtaining an exact idea of its social peculiarities, are not one jot greater than in the old days of absolute exclusion. “The situation of travellers in China,” says M. Abel Remusat, “is not usually an enviable one.

At their departure from Canton they are imprisoned in closed boats; they are guarded carefully from sight all along the great canal; they are what we may call put under arrest immediately on their arrival at Peking; and, after two or three official receptions and interrogatories, they are hastily sent back again. As they are not allowed the slightest communication with the outer world, they can really describe from their own knowledge nothing more than the hedge of soldiers by which they have been surrounded, the songs of the boatmen who have accompanied them, the formalities employed by the inspectors who have searched them, and the evolutions of the grandees who prostrated themselves with them before the Son of Heaven."

It may well be doubted, therefore, whether the recent contributions to our stock of information regarding China, are in reality such as materially to modify the ideas which have prevailed since the publication of the various memoirs of the early Jesuit missionaries. Their information was obtained in circumstances very different from those of the modern traveller. The favour which they enjoyed under the benevolent emperor, Khang-hi, opened for them an access, not only to all the historical records of the empire, to its public institutions, and to the detail of its laws, its constitution, its agriculture, and its commerce, but to all those social and religious peculiarities which, even still, constitute the great puzzle of private life in China. The familiarity, too, with the Chinese language and literature, which long residence and careful and judicious study imparted, gives an air of solidity and confidence to their statements, very different from the half wonder, half conjecture of their modern successors; and above all, the spirit of association in which they compiled their information, and the mutual light and assistance, which, as members of one great body, and fellow-labourers in one great and holy cause, they communicated to each other;—have made their narratives appear not the work of a single writer, or the result of the experience of a single observer, but the fruit of the joint observation and the united intelligence of the most eminent members of this memorable mission.

Such was the deliberate judgment of the greatest master of Chinese literature that the world has ever yet seen—M. Abel Remusat. The theoretical opinion which M.

Rémusat drew from his profound and familiar book-knowledge, is fully confirmed by the practical judgment to which the writer of the admirable work now before us, has arrived after long years of travel and residence in the country, and manifold experience of life among the singular races of this vast empire, from the beggar to the mandarin, and in all its motley forms, from the palace to the mountain hamlet.

Our readers, we are assured, will need no introduction to Père Huc, the lively and brilliant author of "*The Chinese Empire*." When last we took leave of this pleasant writer, it was with the earnest hope that, as the concluding paragraphs of his "*Travels in Tartary and Tibet*" seemed to promise, we might "meet him again soon and often." Even then, however, we scarcely hoped for so important and valuable a contribution to our knowledge of China and its institutions, as that with which we are here presented, as the fruit of his interval of leisure. "*The Chinese Empire*" is not, like the author's earlier work, a mere traveller's tale of what he had heard and seen in his adventurous journey; it is a learned, laborious, and scholar-like description of all that is most notable, as well as most characteristic, in the entire condition of the country which was the scene of his travel. And it is no exaggeration to say, that the volumes now upon our table form a compendious, but most comprehensive, encyclopædia of the religion, the laws, the usages, and institutions of China.

In so far, however, as the work is a personal narrative, it may be regarded as a sequel to the "*Travels in Tartary and Tibet*." At the close of that interesting narrative, we left Père Huc, and his devoted companion and fellow-missionary, Père Gabet, upon the extreme western frontier of China; which they had reached on their return from Tibet, by order of Ki-chan, the Chinese resident at the Tibetan capital, Lha-Ssa. By command of this jealous and officious functionary, they were proceeding under escort to present themselves before the authorities of the empire, and to render an account of the objects and motives which had prompted their unwonted and almost unheard of undertaking. The purpose of the present work, therefore, is to complete the history of that most interesting expedition. It contains the record of their journey from Ta-tsien-lou, on the extreme western border of China, to Canton and

Macao—a journey which traversed nearly the entire eastern and western diameter of the Chinese territory.

But Père Huc's work is far more than a personal narrative. He has contrived to string together, in a most interesting sketch of which his own personal adventures supply the outline, the results of his observation, and the fruits of his study, not only during this eventful journey, (and another journey equally adventurous, extending along the north and south diameter,) but also during a residence of above ten years in different parts of the empire. In this regard, the work is far more elaborate than the *Travels in Tartary*; and in every respect it is more important for the purposes of the general scholar.

There is another difference between Père Huc's "China," and the "Tartary and Tibet" of the same author, which the reader will not observe without deep pain and regret—the absence from its title-page of the honoured name of Père Gabet, with which that of M. Huc was so long associated, both in the former work itself, and in their numerous and valuable contributions to the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith." The good and zealous father, for so many years the associate of his toils and the companion of his wanderings, has been taken from him by death since his last publication. After surviving all the perils of the mountain and the desert, and for years braving captivity and death, in the various forms in which, in later times, they have been always present to the missionary in this jealous empire, Père Gabet died upon the homeward passage to Europe; on which he had set out alone, in order to take measures for re-organizing a missionary expedition to the kingdom of Tibet, from which he had himself been so summarily ejected.

Père Huc appears, therefore, as the sole author of the "Chinese Empire."

The travellers had been conducted by the escort assigned to them at Lha-Ssa, as far as Ta-t sien-lou, a small town upon the frontier of China. From this point the duty of providing for their transit devolved upon the local Chinese authorities; and in the first place on the authorities of the province of Sse-tchouen, the first through which their homeward route lay. Their case, indeed, had been referred for adjudication to the governor of that province, the viceroy Pao-King, cousin and intimate friend of the

reigning emperor. The seat of his court was, of course, at T'oung-tou-fou, the capital of the province.

Taught by their past experience of Chinese officials, the travellers resolved, in their dealings with the mandarins, to carry all with a high hand. It is a maxim of state policy in China, to be strong with the weak and weak with the strong, and Père Huc and his companion appear never to have lost sight of this all-important key to the character of those with whom they were thrown into contact. Their first step, before setting out, was to exchange their Tibetan travelling costume for one better suited to Chinese notions; and the principle by which their whole course of conduct was shaped, may be inferred from the fact, that, being in all else attired after the newest fashion, in (sky-blue silk robes, and black satin boots with white soles,) they assumed *the yellow cap and red sash*, which in China are the distinctive marks of the members of the imperial family! The mandarins remonstrated against the assumption, but in vain. The travellers persisted in maintaining, as French citizens, their right of exemption from the customs of the country; and they carried their point. By the same steady firmness, which at times ran into what, in the mildest phrase, must be called "modest assurance," they succeeded in almost every contest in which they engaged. Insisting firmly, when firmness appeared sufficient; swaggering at time when stronger measures were needed; expostulating; threatening; even bullying, when occasion arose;—our sturdy adventurers fought their way successfully from one extremity of the empire to the other, baffling the roguery of mandarins, defeating the malice of commissioners, trampling on the pride of prefects, and openly braving the undisguised hostility of judges and governors. By the terms of the original judgment of the Chinese president at Lha-Ssa, in virtue of which they had been sent back from Tibet, they were entitled to be regarded as state prisoners during their journey, and to be treated accordingly;—their escort, lodging, maintenance, and means of transport, being all provided at the public expense; and the viceroy of the province of Sse-tchouen issued still more express and minute instructions as to the treatment which they were to receive. According to the usage of China, all such charges are provided for by the local authorities of each district; on whom, therefore, devolves the duty of supplying the travel-

lers with suitable lodging and entertainment during their stay within their jurisdiction, together with means of proceeding to the next stage of their onward route. These officials, consequently, had an interest in keeping down as much as possible every item of these charges ; in inducing the travellers to be content with the meanest and most inexpensive accommodation ; and in getting rid of them with the least possible delay. Hence the entire journey was one series of petty intrigues, on the part of the local mandarins, for the purpose either of altogether evading their claims to entertainment, or of making some secret personal profit while they seemed to discharge them. At one time the mandarin would refuse to recognize them as state travellers ; at another he would try, by neglect and contemptuous indifference, to force them into betaking themselves to public inns, or houses of entertainment ; at another, the supply of provisions would be insufficient, and their quality bad. And above all, the great point which they sought to accomplish, was to prevent the travellers being lodged in the Communal Palace ; a building which is maintained in each principal town for the express purpose of lodging members of the imperial family, and all functionaries of state, during their official stay in the locality. The pretences by which this right of the missionaries was almost uniformly resisted, were most various, and often extremely amusing. But their firmness, cool perseverance, and exceeding tact and cleverness, almost invariably triumphed. When they failed of carrying the Communal Palace by storm, they took possession of the next best public accommodation which presented itself ; and few tourists in any country can boast of a greater variety of lodging than M. Huc and his companion ; who appear equally at home in a Communal Palace, an inn, a monastery, a college, a theatre, and even a court of justice !

Scarcely less amusing are the travellers' contests with the officers and members of the escorts assigned to them in the several provinces. There is more of real every-day Chinese life in some of these clever and dashing sketches, than could be gathered from whole pages of description and dissertation. Thus, for example, the "Military Mandarin," "Master Ting," the "Weeping Willow," and the servant Wei-chan, are sketches not unworthy of "Boz" himself.

The route prescribed for M. Huc and his fellow-prisoner lay through the provinces of Sse-tchouen, Hou-pe, and Kiang-si, to Kouang-tong, in which are situated the cities of Canton and Macao. First of all, however, they were subjected to examination and trial at Tching-tou-fou, the capital of Sse-tchouen, and the first city of note which they encountered after entering China Proper. They were first cited to appear before two criminal commissioners, or judges. It was vehemently insisted that they should present themselves for trial according to Chinese usage, in a kneeling posture. True to their old principles, however, they doggedly refused to comply; and, to the infinite humiliation of the officials, and the undisguised amazement of the by-standers, the contest terminated in their being allowed to remain standing during the interrogation.

"An immense crowd surrounded the tribunal; amongst this assemblage of the populace, eager to see the faces of the 'devils of the Western Sea,' were a few sympathetic-looking countenances, which seemed to say, 'You are in a very unfortunate position, and we can do nothing for you.' The dejection of these poor Christians pained us, and gladly would we have infused into their souls a little of the calmness and peace with which our own were filled. The way was cleared by soldiers armed with bamboos and rattans, the great doors were opened, and we entered. We were placed in a small waiting room, with the two amiable companions that had been assigned to us, and thence we could amuse ourselves by contemplating the movement and the sensation that reigned in the tribunal. The Mandarins who were to take part in the ceremonial arrived in succession, followed by suits of attendants, who had uncommonly the appearance of gangs of thieves. The satellites ran backwards and forwards, in their long red robes, and hideous peaked hats of black felt or iron wire, surmounted by long pheasant's feathers. They were armed with long rusty swords, and carried chains, pincers, and various instruments of torture, of strong and terrible forms. The Mandarins were collected in groups, talking with one another, and interrupting themselves frequently by bursts of laughter; the subaltern officers, scribes, and executioners, went and came, as if to give themselves airs of importance; and every one seemed to anticipate a scene that would be curious and seasoned by unaccustomed emotions.

"All this agitation, and these interminable preparations, had in them something of extravagance and exaggeration; they were evidently intended to frighten us. At length every one had found his place, and the tumult was succeeded by a profound silence. A

moment afterwards a terrible cry, uttered by a great number of voices, was heard in the hall of audience ; it was repeated three times, and our companions told us that it was on the judges making their solemn entry and installing themselves in their seats. Two officers, decorated with the Crystal Ball, then appeared, and made us a sign to follow them. They came between us, our companions placed themselves behind, and the two accused persons walked thus to judgment.

"A great door was then suddenly opened, and we beheld, at a glance, the numerous personages of this Chinese *performance*. Twelve stone steps led up to the vast inclosure where the judges were placed ; on each side of this staircase was a line of executioners in red dresses ; and when the accused passed tranquilly through their ranks, they all cried out with a loud voice, 'Tremble ! Tremble !' and rattled their instruments of torture. We were stopped at about the middle of the hall, and then eight officers of the court proclaimed in a chanting voice the customary formula :— 'Accused ! on your knees ! on your knees !' The accused remained silent and motionless. The summons was repeated, but there was still no alteration in their attitude. The two officers with the Crystal Ball, now thought themselves called on to come to our assistance, and pulled our arms to help us to kneel down. But a solemn look and some few emphatic words sufficed to make them let go their hold. They even judged it expedient to retire a little, and keep a respectful distance.

" 'Every empire,' said we, addressing our judges, 'has its own customs and manners. When we appeared before the ambassador Ki-Chan at Lha-ssa, we remained standing ; and Ki-Chan considered that in doing so we were only acting with reasonable conformity to the customs of our country.'

"We waited for an answer from the president, but he remained dumb. The other judges contented themselves with looking at us, and communicating among themselves by grimaces. The tribunal had apparently been arranged and decorated expressly for the purpose of giving us a high idea of the majesty of the Empire. The walls were hung with red draperies, on which certain sentences were written in large black characters ; gigantic lanterns of the brightest colours were suspended from the ceiling ; and behind the seats of the judges were seen the insignia of their dignity, borne by officers in rich silk robes. The hall was surrounded by a great number of soldiers in uniform and under arms, and along the sides were seated a select number of spectators, who had probably obtained their places through favour and patronage."—Pp. 48-50.

This interrogation turned entirely upon their object and motives in visiting Tibet. The papers which had been seized by Ki-chan, the Resident at Lha-ssa, were produced, and an attempt was made by the "Inspector of

Crimes," (the Chinese attorney-general) to give a treasonable colouring to their mission. Père Huc, however, with that cool dexterity which is his great characteristic, contrived not only to decline answering the interrogatories of this functionary, but to enlist so effectually upon his side the vanity of the chief commissioner, that the trial terminated in the abandonment of all the charges against them.

Soon after the close of this trial, which had the effect of completely turning the tide of opinion in their favour, they had an audience of the viceroy, Pao-king. He received them with great kindness, dismissed the mandarin who had been their escort, and had treated them badly upon the journey; and condemned in the strongest terms the officiousness of Ki-chan (whom he testily denounced as a *to-che* "creator of embarrassments,") in interfering at all with their liberty of residence in Tibet. He refused, nevertheless, to permit their return to that kingdom; alleging, that, having once been dismissed, he had no choice but to send them forward to the representative of their own nation at Canton or Macao. This, however, he promised to do in a manner befitting their character, and not unworthy the dignity of the great sovereign whom he represented; and in order to secure a literal compliance with his instructions in this regard, and to guard against fraud or ill will on the part of the local authorities upon the route, he furnished themselves with a copy of these instructions, detailing minutely the sort of accommodation to which they should be held entitled. We should add, that Pao-King remonstrated against the *yellow cap and red girdle*; but, on their persisting in the fancy for this costume, he laughingly gave way to what he considered an amusing peculiarity of taste.

Père Huc describes, with much humour, the childish simplicity with which this good old man (the most amiable specimen of Chinese official life recorded in the work) scrutinized the features and general appearance of the strangers, and enquired after the recipe whereby they had contrived to preserve so well their good looks and fresh complexion. His enquiries, too, on the subject of religion interested them very much in his regard; and Père Huc, after his arrival at Macao, actually undertook a journey to Peking for the purpose of renewing his relations with him, but was deeply mortified to find that the old man had died only a fortnight before his arrival.

After remaining some time at Tching-tou-fou, in order to recruit from the fatigues of their journey, the missionaries prepared to resume their coastward journey. At their parting audience of the viceroy, he communicated to them a circumstance which goes to show that the notion which used to be entertained as to the astronomical skill of the Chinese, is far from well founded. Speaking of the calendar, he confessed that the government had begun to anticipate a serious embarrassment. The first European missionaries, he said, had corrected many errors in the ancient calendar of China, and had constructed a perpetual calendar for a certain period, which had served, ever since, as the basis of the actual arrangement of festivals for each year. *This period, however, he added, was now drawing to a close*; and he asked Père Huc whether, as the Office of Mathematics at Peking *had declared itself incapable of preparing a new one*, it might not be possible to induce the missionaries to repeat the good office performed long since by their predecessors.

We cannot help regarding this as a favourable opening; provided only there be, among the members actually engaged in the present work of the mission, individuals capable of commanding by their astronomical attainments, the same respect and authority which rewarded the services of Father Ricci and his accomplished companions. Père Huc took occasion from this demand, to call the viceroy's attention to the signal ingratitude towards the memory of those distinguished scholars, which had been manifested by the Imperial government at Peking, in seizing upon the very tombs in which their remains had been deposited, and suffering them to be rifled by the populace, and treated with every species of indignity. He adds that the intelligence appeared to shock and startle the viceroy exceedingly; and that he promised to write at once to Peking upon the subject, and at a later time to make it matter for personal investigation.

Beyond the petty annoyances to which we have already alluded, and the amusing contests with the cupidity or dishonesty of officials, in the regulation of their dietary or their travelling accommodation, the missionaries' journey was not marked by any serious personal adventure. But it introduced them into almost every variety of Chinese life. It is, perhaps, to be regretted, that in this work, as well as in the "Tibet," the author has omitted to assign the

dates of the several events which he records ; and indeed, that, so far from supplying a regular diary of his progress, he has even left the reader almost completely in the dark as regards the time of his setting out from Ta-t sien-lou, merely stating that he arrived at Canton in October, 1846. Most of the information, it is true, is of such a character as to be entirely independent of time ; but we cannot help feeling that it loses in interest and lifelike character by this oversight.

The journey was performed partly by palanquin, partly by water. Their voyage across the lake Pou- yang, in the province of Kiang-si, was made in one of the ordinary trading-junks, and was disagreeable beyond description ; these vessels being all infested by a most disgusting and annoying beetle, called by the Dutch, *kakkerlac*, which delights in gnawing the ears and toes of the sleeping traveller. The voyage, however, from Nan-tchang-fou, the capital of Kiang-si, appears to have made ample amends for the wretchedness of their earlier river expeditions. It was performed in a very handsome and commodious mandarin junk, amply provided with every necessary, and even luxury, which could be desired. The entire distance from this city to Canton (with the exception of a day's journey over the mountain Mei-ling) was travelled in this manner ; the voyage having commenced at Nan-tchang-fou, and terminated on the great river Kiang, on which Canton is built. The whole time occupied between their leaving Lha-Ssa and reaching Canton was six months.

As a sample of Père Huc's mode of dealing with ill-disposed officials, we transcribe the following curious adventure. During their stay in the unimportant town of Han-yang, where they were treated so badly, that, under a mixed impulse of hunger and indignation, they were imprudent enough, instead of insisting, as elsewhere, on redress, to purchase provisions from their own funds, an impression had been created that they were weak and easy-going souls, whom it would not be difficult to impose upon. This reputation preceded them to Ouchtchang-fou, the chief town of the province of Hou-pe ; and they soon experienced its fruit in being condemned to take up their abode in a miserable room, where they ran considerable risk of being suffocated. For two days

they found it impossible to obtain redress. At last, however, they resolved to change their tone.

"After having put on our dress of ceremony, we sent for some palanquin bearers, and commanded them to conduct us to the Governor of the Province. They looked at us in a hesitating manner, but we paid them in advance, promising them at the same time something handsome on our return, and then they set off with enthusiasm.

"We crossed the square, where the venerable Perboyre had been strangled, and arrived at the tribunal where he had been so cruelly tortured, and where sentence of death had been pronounced against him.

"We alighted from our palanquins at the entrance of the palace, and so far our enterprise had not been very difficult. We crossed the threshold, determined to bear down all obstacles that should intervene to prevent our approach to the Governor. We had scarcely reached the middle of the courtyard before we were surrounded by a crowd of satellites and attendants, such as usually throng the avenues to the great tribunals, but their sinister hang-dog physiognomies, with which we had been long familiarised, did not alarm us much. We marched on boldly, affecting not to hear the thousand remarks that were made around us, on the subject of our yellow caps and red girdles.

"At the moment when we were about to cross a hall to enter a second court, we were accosted by a little Mandarin with a gilt ball, who seemed to be acting as a sort of usher to introduce guests. He appeared quite aghast at our abrupt entrance, and placing himself in our way, he asked three times running where we were going, extending at the same time his two arms in a horizontal position, as if to bar our passage.

" 'We are going to his Excellency the Governor,' we replied.

" 'His Excellency the Governor is not there. You can't see the Governor. Do the Rites permit people to push in in that way to the first magistrate of the province ?' and as he spoke he stamped about and gesticulated, and with his arms extended followed every one of our movements, jumping alternately to the right and the left to prevent us from passing. We walked on, nevertheless, without saying a word, and thus forced our introducer to walk backwards. As we reached the end of the hall he turned suddenly, and threw himself upon the two leaves of the folding door, as if to shut them ; but seizing him by the arm, we cried out in the most imperious tone we could muster, 'Woe to you if you do not leave that door open. If you stop us for a single moment, you are a lost man.'

"These words inspired a salutary fear ; he opened the door again, and we entered the second court, leaving the little man gazing after us in open-mouthed astonishment.

"We reached the Governor's apartments without any new obstacle. In the ante-chamber were four superior Mandarins, who, when we entered, seemed to doubt whether we were not ghosts. They gazed at us and at one another without speaking a word, and as if consulting each other as to what was to be done in these unexpected circumstances. At length one of them ventured to ask who we were. 'We are Frenchmen,' we replied; 'we have been at Peking, thence from Peking to Lha-ssa, in Thibet; and we wish to speak with his Excellency the Governor.'

"'But is his Excellency the Governor informed of your arrival at Ou-tchang-fou? Has your visit been announced to him?'

"'A dispatch from the Emperor ought to have informed him of our coming to Hou-pé.' We remarked that the words 'dispatch from the Emperor' had an effect on the Mandarins. The speaker, after fixing upon us for a moment an inquisitive look, disappeared through a little door. We suspected that he had gone to the Governor to announce to him the curious discovery he had just made; and he was not long before he returned.

"'The Governor is absent,' said he, in a perfectly easy manner, just as if he had not been telling a lie; 'the Governor is absent. When he returns he will send for you, if he has any thing to say to you. Now go back to your lodgings.'

"'Who is it who desires us to go away? Who told you to say the Governor would send for us? Why do you seek to deceive us by pronouncing words contrary to the truth? The Governor is here; you have just spoken with him, and we will not go away till we have seen him.' As we said this, we quietly seated ourselves on a broad divan that occupied a great part of the room. The Mandarins astonished at our doings made their exit all together, and left us alone.

"At Han-yang, as we have said, we had betrayed much weakness, and it was now necessary to repair this fault, if we wished to reach Canton in safety, instead of perishing in misery on the road. The benevolence of the Viceroy of Sse-tchouen could not avail us farther than Ou-tchang-fou; the Governor of Hou-pé would now have the disposal of us as far as the capital of Kiang-si, and it was absolutely necessary that we should speak with him, in order not to be abandoned entirely to the voracity of the petty Mandarins. We were left alone for a long time, so that we had full leisure to arrange the plan we intended to follow.

"At length an aged attendant appeared, who after having in a manner *applied* his face to ours, in order to take a good observation of them, said in a tremulous voice, that 'His Excellency the Governor invited our illustrious persons to come to him.'—Vol. ii. p. 153-6.

The governor attempted at first to put on an air of authority; but the steady coolness of our missionaries speedily

subdued him. They did not hesitate to ascribe the treatment which they had met to hostility to themselves and their country. That very city had been the scene of the martyrdom of Father Perboyre, and twenty years before of that of Father Clet, a member of the same mission. When the governor offered an indignant disclaimer of any evil intentions to the travellers, they reminded him of these facts.

"When the time came, we said to him, in a very low tone, but with a certain cold and concentrated energy, 'Your Excellency, we are not in the habit of pronouncing rude and injurious words; it is not right to assume bad intentions in our brethren; nevertheless, we are missionaries of the Lord of Heaven; we are Frenchmen, and we cannot forget that this town is called Ou-tchang-fou.'

"What is the meaning of these words? I do not comprehend them.'

"We cannot forget that one of our brothers, a missionary, a Frenchman, was strangled here at Ou-tchang-fou, twenty-three years ago; and that another of our brothers, also a missionary and a Frenchman, was put to death here, not quite six years ago.'

"On hearing these words the Governor changed countenance, and it was evident he was greatly agitated.

"This very day,' we continued, 'in coming here, we crossed the square upon which our brothers were executed. Can it then be surprising if we feel some uneasiness, if we fear that some attempt may be made upon our lives, especially when we have been lodged almost in a sepulchre?'

"I don't know what you mean; I know nothing about these affairs,' replied the Governor, hastily; 'at the periods of which you speak I was not in the province.'

"We are aware of that; the Governor who was here six years ago, as soon as he had given the order to have the French missionary strangled, was degraded by the Emperor, and condemned to perpetual exile. It was evident to the whole Empire that Heaven had avenged the innocent blood. No one, however, need answer for more than his own actions. But whose fault is it that we are now being treated in the manner we have described? We have studied the writings of the philosopher Meng-tse, and we have read in them this: 'Meng-tse one day asked the king of Leang whether he thought there was any difference between killing a man with a sword and killing him with illtreatment, and the king of Leang replied, I do not think there is any difference.'

"The Governor appeared very much astonished to hear us quote a passage from the classical books. He endeavoured to throw a little more gentleness into his physiognomy and manners, and he thought proper to reassure us concerning the fears we had expressed

for our personal safety. He said that the Mandarins had executed his orders badly, that he would have a severe inquiry into the matter, and that every body's sins should be punished, since he was determined to have respect paid to the will of the Emperor, whose heart was filled with quite paternal kindness for strangers, as we had ourselves experienced in the treatment we had received at Sse-tchouen, and all along the road. He added that we should be equally well treated at Hou-pé, that we must not believe those stories of two of our countrymen having been put to death in past times. Those were merely idle and false reports invented by low people, whose tongues were always active, and given to lying."—Vol. ii. pp. 159-161.

In other cases, on the contrary, they were overwhelmed with marks of honour and respect; as after leaving Tching-tou-fou:—

"During the first hour of our march, we noticed all along the road the hurry and activity that is always seen more or less in the neighbourhood of great towns, but more especially in China, where traffic keeps every one perpetually in motion. Horsemen, pedestrians, porters, thronged the road, and raised clouds of dust, that soon completely enveloped us and our palanquins, and threatened to suffocate us. By degrees, as we advanced, all these busy travellers had to slacken their pace, and get out of the way, and, in fact, to stop, in order to allow us to pass. The horsemen alighted, and those who wore large straw hats had to take them off. Those who did not hasten to show these marks of respect to the illustrious 'Devils of the West,' were graciously invited to do so, by a shower of thumps with the rattan, bestowed by way of reminder by two of our attendants, who acquitted themselves *con amore* of so pleasant a duty. When people spared them the trouble by being voluntarily mindful of 'the rites,' they walked off, looking rather sulky, and eyeing with a disappointed look their idle bamboos."—Vol. i. pp. 164, 165.

Instead, however, of pursuing in detail the personal adventures of our missionaries, we prefer to lay before the reader a few specimens of the results of their general experience, of the manners, institutions, and social and religious condition of this extraordinary people, among whom they mingled so long, and with such unprecedented freedom and familiarity.

The habitual student of the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith," will remember with pleasure the numerous and interesting notices of Christianity in China, which appeared periodically in that Journal

from the pen of Père Huc and his companion. In the present work, as being intended mainly for general readers, M. Huc has advisedly refrained from entering into this subject in much detail. He states, however, in general, that the total number of Christians in the Chinese empire is about 800,000; variously distributed over the eighteen provinces, which are governed by vicars apostolic, assisted by missionaries, both from the secular clergy and from the Jesuit, Dominicans, Lazarist, and Franciscan orders. Each vicariate, besides a number of local schools for youth, possesses an ecclesiastical seminary for the training of native clergy; and associations have been formed in very many places for the care and Christian education of infants, abandoned (after the cruel usage of the country) by their parents;—an institution from which the best results are confidently anticipated.

The position of the Catholic missionaries in China, nevertheless, is a difficult and painful one. The nominal toleration which they are supposed to enjoy is in reality not only painfully restricted, but miserably precarious. It is true that by virtue of an edict obtained by the interposition of M. Lagrenée, the French commissioner, at the close of the war, Chinese Christians are no longer punishable, unless for some specific crime against the law. Nevertheless, besides the reports to the same effect, which he received from several priests and vicars apostolic, Père Huc found the Christians in almost every part of his travel, in the most abject fear, from the malevolence or corrupt practices of the higher officials and their minor functionaries. As far as the free ports are concerned liberty of worship is guaranteed, and the presence of the representatives of the European courts may be expected to secure its maintenance. But for the interior no such security exists. All attempts at preaching in the interior are rigidly repressed: the offending missionary is liable to be arrested, and transmitted to the nearest consul of his nation, to be dealt with according to his own code; and although the law provides that this transmission shall be conducted in an honourable manner, Père Huc mentions certain very recent cases in which a French Lazarist missionary, P. Carayon, was sent to Canton loaded with chains, in the company of malefactors, and treated with such severity that he died soon afterwards; an Italian missionary was literally starved to death; and a third,

M. Vacher, in 1851, was arrested in the province of Nun-Gan, thrown into prison, and in the end suffocated.

This intolerance, however, of which Christians are the victims, is by no means based upon religious principles. It is the pure result of that system of jealousy and exclusiveness which is the guiding spirit of all the legislation of China, and of the whole machinery of its administrative government. Christianity is an object of suspicion, not because it is a religious system, but because it is a foreign, and is believed to be an anti-Chinese, system. It is looked to with a vague and half acknowledged terror as the fine end of the European wedge; and, as such, all its advances are jealously watched. Far from its being an object of apprehension on religious grounds, it is, on the contrary, regarded with profound indifference, and its merits as such are freely and unreservedly admitted. The real enemy to the diffusion of Christianity in China is not intolerance, but indifference.

"It is this radical, profound indifference to all religion—an indifference that is scarcely conceivable by any who have not witnessed it—which is in our opinion the real, grand obstacle that has so long opposed the progress of Christianity in China. The Chinese is so completely absorbed in temporal interests, in the things that fall under his senses, that his whole life is only materialism put in action.

"Lucro is the sole object on which his eyes are constantly fixed. A burning thirst to realise some profit, great or small, absorbs all his faculties—the whole energy of his being. He never pursues any thing with ardour but riches and material enjoyments. God—the soul—a future life—he believes in none of them, or, rather, he never thinks about them at all. If he ever takes up a moral or religious book, it is only by way of amusement—to pass the time away. It is a less serious occupation than smoking a pipe, or drinking a cup of tea. If you speak to him of the foundations of faith, of the principles of Christianity, of the importance of salvation, the certainty of a life beyond the grave—all these truths, which so powerfully impress a mind susceptible of religious feeling, he listens to with pleasure, for it amuses him and piques his curiosity. He admits everything, approves of all you say, does not find the least difficulty, or make the smallest objection. In his opinion, all this is 'true, fine, grand,' and he puts himself into an oratorical attitude, and makes a beautiful speech against idolatry, and in favour of Christianity. He deplores the blindness of men, who attach themselves to the perishable goods of this world; perhaps he will even give utterance to some fine sentences on the happiness of

knowing the true ^{God}; of serving him, and of meriting by this means the reward of eternal life. To listen to him, you would think him just ready to become a Christian, in fact, that he was such already; yet he has not advanced a single step. It must not, however, be supposed that his speeches are wholly insincere; he does really—after a fashion—believe what he says; at all events, he has certainly no conviction to the contrary; he merely never thinks of religion as a serious matter at all. He likes very well to talk about it; but it is as of a thing not made for him—that he personally has nothing to do with it. The Chinese carry this indifference so far,—religious sensibility is so entirely withered or dead within them,—that they care not a straw whether a doctrine be true or false, good or bad. Religion is to them simply a fashion, which those may follow who have a taste for it.

“In one of the principal towns of China, we were for some time in communication with a lettered Chinese, who appeared extremely well disposed to embrace Christianity. We had several conferences together, and we studied carefully the most important and difficult points of doctrine, and finally, by way of complement to our oral instruction, we read some of the best books. Our dear Catechumen admitted, without any exception, every thing we advanced; the only difficulty was, he said, the learning by heart the prayers, that every good Christian ought to know, in order to say them morning and evening. As he seemed nevertheless to desire putting off to some indefinite period the moment in which he should declare himself a Christian, every time he came to see us we urged him to do so, and made the most earnest representation of the duty of following the truth, now that he knew where it lay. ‘By and by,’ said he; ‘all in good time. One should never be precipitate.’ One day, however, he spoke out a little more. ‘Come,’ said he, ‘let us speak to-day only words conformable to reason. It is not good to be too enthusiastic. No doubt the Christian religion is beautiful and sublime; its doctrine explains, with method and clearness, all that it is necessary for man to know. Whoever has any sense must see that, and will adopt it in his heart in all sincerity; but, after all, one must not think too much of these things, and increase the cares of life. Now, just consider—we have a body; how many cares it demands! It must be clothed, fed, and sheltered from the injuries of the weather; its infirmities are great, and its maladies numerous. It is agreed on all hands, that health is our most precious good. This body that we see, that we touch, must be taken care of every day, and every moment of the day. Now is not this enough, without troubling ourselves about a soul that we never do see? The life of man is short and full of misery; it is made up of a succession of important concerns, that follow one another without interruption. Our hearts and our minds are scarcely sufficient for the solitudes of the present life—is it wise then to torment one’s self about the future one?’—Vol. i. p. 160—163.

Indeed, the indifference of this strange race extends to more than supernatural interests. There is much humour, and not without application to our own times and circumstances, in the following incident of Chinese travel.

"In ordinary times, and when they are not under the influence of any revolutionary movement, the Chinese are not at all inclined to meddle with affairs of government; they are a delightfully quiet people to deal with. In 1851, at the period of the death of the Emperor *Tao-kouang*, we were travelling on the road from Peking, and one day, when we had been taking tea at an inn in company with some Chinese citizens, we tried to get up a little political discussion. We spoke of the recent death of the Emperor, an important event which, of course, must have interested everybody. We expressed our anxiety on the subject of the succession to the Imperial throne, the heir to which was not yet publicly declared. 'Who knows,' said we, 'which of the three sons of the Emperor will have been appointed to succeed him?' If it should be the eldest, will he pursue the same system of government? If the younger, he is still very young; and it is said there are contrary influences, two opposing parties, at court—to which will he lean?' We put forward, in short, all kinds of hypotheses, in order to stimulate these good citizens to make some observation. But they hardly listened to us. We came back again and again to the charge, in order to elicit some opinion or other, on questions that really appeared to us of great importance. But to all our piquant suggestions, they replied only by shaking their heads, puffing out whiffs of smoke, and taking great gulps of tea.

"This apathy was really beginning to provoke us, when one of these worthy Chinese, getting up from his seat, came and laid his two hands on our shoulders in a manner quite paternal, and said, smiling rather ironically,—

"'Listen to me, my friend! Why should you trouble your heart and fatigue your head by all these vain surmises? The Mandarins have to attend to affairs of State; they are paid for it. Let them earn their money, then. But don't let us torment ourselves about what does not concern us. We should be great fools to want to do political business for nothing.'

"'That is very conformable to reason,' cried the rest of the company; and thereupon they pointed out to us that our tea was getting cold and our pipes were out.'—Vol. i. pp. 96, 97.

As regards the actual religion of the Chinese population, Père Huc's account fully bears out this picture of their indifference to Christianity. There can hardly be said to be such a thing as a state religion in China; but all religions are tolerated unless those which are reputed

to be politically dangerous—the real ground, as we have seen, of the national antipathy to Christianity. There are three religions, however, which are recognized as equally good, and equally admissible to all the social and political advantages of citizenship: the *Jou Kiao*, or “Doctrine of the Lettered,” which is the religion of Confucius; the religion of the *Tao-Sse*, or “Doctors of Reason,” derived from the teaching of Lao-Tze, a philosopher contemporary with Confucius; and the religion of Fo, which is the Chinese transcript of Buddha, the imported Buddhism of ancient India. We can only refer to Père Huc's own pages for a very brief but accurate and comprehensive account of all these religions. But, as illustrating the actual condition of religious feeling among the Chinese, we cannot pass over the following startling revelation.

“The three religions of which we have spoken in the preceding chapter, and which are personified by Confucius, Lao-tze, and Buddha, or Fo, still exist in China. After having struggled fiercely for ages, the one against the other, they are now united in universal indifference, and there reigns among them the most profound peace. This result must be principally attributed to the literary classes.

“The Doctors of Reason and the Buddhists had abandoned themselves to so many superstitions, that the disciples of Confucius had no great difficulty in turning them into ridicule. The pamphlets full of spirited satire which they have continually been firing off at the Bonzes and the Tao-sse have at length stifled in these people every religious sentiment, and the Emperors themselves have done their parts towards plunging the nation into the scepticism which is eating away its spiritual life, and effecting its dissolution with frightful rapidity. There is still extant a collection of sentences composed by the Emperor Khang-Hi for the instruction of his people; and Yoang-tching, who succeeded him on the Imperial throne, has made commentaries on his father's sentences, which are intended to be read in public by the magistrates. One of the points on which the princely commentator particularly insists, is the propriety of cherishing an aversion to all false sects, that is to say, in fact, for all religions. He passes them in review, and condemns them all, without exception; but that of Buddhism, which is the most widely diffused in China, is especially the object of his reprobation. He speaks of the dogmas on which it rests with contempt; he turns its practices into derision.

“The Buddhists, like other followers of Indian sects, attach much importance to certain words or syllables, which they repeat continually, thinking to purify themselves from their sins, by the

mere articulation of these holy syllables, and to effect their salvation by this easy method. The Imperial commentator rallies them keenly upon this practice. 'Suppose,' he says, 'you had violated the laws in some way, and that you were taken into the hall of judgment to be punished; do you think if you were to go on bawling a thousand times over, 'Your Excellency! your Excellency!' the magistrate would be any more likely to spare you for that?' In other passages, this comparison tends to nothing less than the destruction of all idea of worship or homage rendered to the divinity. These sentences are real lessons in atheism, addressed by a sovereign to his subjects.

"If you do not burn any paper in honour of Fo, and if you do not deposit any offerings on his altar, he will be displeased, you think, and send his judgments on your head. What a miserable creature must your god Fo be then! Let us take the example of the magistrate of your district: should you never go to compliment him, and pay your court to him, if you are a honest people, attentive to your duty, he will not the less be well disposed towards you; but if you transgress the law, commit violence, and encroach on the rights of others, he will always be dissatisfied with you, though you should find a thousand ways of flattering him.' The Christian religion is, of course, not spared by the commentator of the Emperor Khang-hi, who was very favourably disposed towards the missionaries, but regarded them merely as artists and learned men, from whom he might obtain some advantage for the State, as the following passage from his successor, Yoang-tching, will tend to prove. 'The sect of the Lord of Heaven,' he says, 'a sect that is perpetually talking about heaven and earth, and beings without substance or shadow, this religion, also, is perverted and corrupt; but as the Europeans who teach it understand astronomy and mathematics, the Government has employed them to correct the calendar. It by no means meant, however, to imply that their religion was good, and you must not believe anything they tell you.'

"Such instruction as this, coming from so high a quarter, could not fail to bear fruit, and all belief in spiritual things and a future life has been accordingly extinguished.

"The religious sentiment has vanished from the national mind; the rival doctrines have lost all authority, and their partisans, grown sceptical and impious, have fallen into the abyss of indifference, in which they have given each other the kiss of peace. Religious discussions have entirely ceased, and the whole Chinese nation has proclaimed this famous formula, with which everybody is satisfied, *San-kiao-y-kiao*, that is, 'the three religions are but one.' Thus all the Chinese are at the same time partisans of Confucius, Lao-tze, and Buddha, or rather, they are nothing at all; they reject all faith, all dogma, to live merely by their more or less depraved and corrupted instincts."—Vol. ii. pp. 195—198.

"From all that we have said concerning the present condition of the various modes of worship recognised in China, and the position of their ministers, it is allowable to conclude that the Chinese are living absolutely without religion. There remain among them a few superstitious practices, to which they yield, rather from habit than conviction, and from which they are very easily detached. No account whatever is taken of religious belief by the legislature, and the magistrates only speak of it to turn it into ridicule. The idea of an atheistical government, and an atheistical law, which in France was so extolled in the Chamber of Deputies, has been actually realised in China, but it does not seem that the nation has greatly gained thereby in grandeur and prosperity."—Vol. ii. pp. 210, 211.

Père Huc's account of the monastic institute of China, and of the habits of life followed, both by the Bonzes and the Bonzesses, is very interesting, and contrasts curiously with his sketches of life among the Lamas in his travels in Tartary and Tibet. He has analyzed well, too, the strange mixture of scepticism and superstition by which the forms of all the old religions are maintained in China, although the soul of faith has long ceased to animate them. We shall transcribe a single anecdote as an example of the entire.

"During our residence at Ou-tchang-fou, in the establishment called *Si-men-yuen*, or Garden of the Western Gate, we happened to be witnesses of an occurrence which shows how possible it is to reconcile the most superstitious practices with the total absence of any religious conviction. We have said that this vast institution, where we were awaiting the day of our departure, had various tenants of different classes. Opposite to the apartment assigned to us, in a spacious court, there was another wing of the building, in a rather elegant style. This was occupied by a retired Mandarin, with a numerous family, who had held formerly a high office in the magistracy, and who had delayed for two years his return to his native province, in the hope that his influence with the first functionaries of the town might obtain for his eldest son a small Mandarinate. This aspirant had as yet only the grade of Bachelor, though he was married, and had three children. During these two years of expectation, the hopes of the old Mandarin had not been realised, but his son, instead of being promoted to a public office, had fallen ill of a malady that seemed likely to carry him to the tomb. At the time of our arrival we found the family plunged into great grief, for the state of the sick man was so alarming that they were already preparing to make him a coffin. The death of

this young man would, it was evident, be regarded by the whole family as a terrible event, for he was its hope and support.

"On the very first night that we passed in our new lodging, the Garden of the Western Gate resounded with cries and the letting off of fireworks, which were heard, sometimes on one side, sometimes on the other, but almost without interruption. The purpose of all this clamour was to save the dying man.

"The Chinese think, as we do, that death is the result of the definite separation of the soul from the body, but they also think that the degree of illness is in direct proportion to the number of attempts which the soul makes to escape, and when the sufferer experiences the terrible crises that endanger his life, it is a proof that the soul has been momentarily absent, that it keeps going away to a certain distance, but returns again. The distance being so small, it is still able to exercise considerable influence on the body, and keep it alive, although it suffers dreadfully from this transitory separation; if the dying person falls into the last agony, it is evident that the soul has gone with the firm resolution not to come back again. Nevertheless all hope is not yet lost, and there is a method of making it take up its abode again in the unfortunate body that is struggling with death. They try first the effect of persuasion, and endeavour by prayers and supplications to induce the soul to change its resolution. They run after it, they conjure it to come back, they describe in the most moving terms the lamentable state to which they will be reduced if this obstinate soul will not hear reason. They tell it that the happiness of the entire family depends upon it, they urge it, flatter it, overwhelm it with entreaties. 'Come back, come back!' they cry, 'what have we done, what have we done to you? What motive can you have for going away? Come back we conjure you,' and as no one knows very well which way the soul is gone, they run in all directions, and make a thousand evolutions in the hope of meeting it, and softening it by their prayers and tears.

"If these mild and insinuating methods do not succeed, if the soul remains deaf, and persists coolly in going its own way, they adopt another course, and try and frighten it. They utter loud cries, they let off fireworks suddenly in every direction in which they imagine it might be making off; they stretch out their arms to bar its passage, and push with their hands to force it to return home and re-enter the body. Amongst those who set out on the chase after a refractory soul, there are always some more skilful than others, who manage to get upon its track. Then they summon the others to help them, calling out, 'Here it is! here it is!' and immediately everybody runs that way. They then unite their forces, they concentrate their plan of operations, they weep, they groan, they lament, they let off squibs and crackers of all kinds, they make a frightful *charivari* round the poor soul, and hustle it

about in all sorts of ways, so that if it does not give it up at last, it must really be a most stubborn and ill-disposed spirit.

"When they are setting out on this strange errand they never fail to take lanterns with them in order to light the soul on its way back, and take away any pretence it might make of not being able to find it. These ceremonies mostly take place during the night, because, say the Chinese, the soul is in the habit of taking advantage of the darkness to slip away."—Vol. ii. pp. 211-214.

A still more ludicrously absurd superstition is observable in connection with the funeral ceremonial. The funeral array is not only attended by a crowd of professional weepers, and accompanied by gongs and other noisy instruments of music, but it is also signalized by the discharge of fire-arms, and various kinds of pyrotechnical explosions. The object of these strange devices is to frighten away the demons which are supposed to pursue, and endeavour to seize the soul of the defunct. But the strangest device of all consists in their strewing about the road in all directions sapecks and *fictitious bank notes*, in order that the devils (who are known to be very fond of money) may be tempted away in pursuit of the supposed bank notes, and that thus, while they are engaged in pursuing those deceitful appearances, the soul may be enabled to proceed quietly upon its way after the coffin which it follows to the last resting-place!

He explains in the same way that worship of ancestors, which formerly occasioned so many controversies between the Jesuit and Dominican missionaries, and which, though still scrupulously maintained, is yet regarded as a hollow and unmeaning ceremony. It is impossible, however, to doubt, that however intended, this ceremonial is in itself, and of its own nature, religious, and not purely civil in its character.

We would most gladly accompany Père Huc through the whole series of his sketches of men and things in China. There is not a topic of interest which he has overlooked—society, morals, politics, law, literature, science, art, costume, commerce, geography, agriculture, horticulture, pisciculture, even down to juggling and rope-dancing. But the information which he has compressed into these admirable sketches is so full and yet so comprehensive, as to preclude the possibility of further condensation. We must, therefore, be content with a few of these topics,

referring the reader, who may desire full information, to the pregnant pages of the work itself.

Père Huc's picture of Chinese morality is fearful in the extreme. Not to speak of the universal dishonesty, want of principle, and utter faithlessness of every class; of the absence of all the higher and more elevating natural affections; of the complete perversion of those domestic relations which are the natural safeguards of virtue; and of the thoroughly debasing and material tone which pervades every sphere of society;—omitting all these considerations, the condition of the people, as regards the external tests of morality, is deplorably low and degraded. Gaming and drunkenness, especially the intoxication of opium, prevail to an extent positively appalling. The grosser vices are equally universal. "Chinese society," Père Huc writes, "has a certain tone of decency and reserve that may very well impose on those who look only at the surface, and judge merely by the momentary impression; but a very short residence among the Chinese is sufficient to show that their virtue is entirely external; their public morality is but a mask worn over the corruption of their manners. We will take care not to lift the unclean veil that hides the putrefaction of this ancient Chinese civilization; the leprosy of vice has spread so completely through this sceptical society, that the varnish of modesty with which it is covered is continually falling off and exposing the hideous wounds which are eating away the vitals of this unbelieving people. Their language is already revoltingly indecent, and the slang of the worst resorts of licentiousness threatens to become the ordinary language of conversation. There are some provinces in which the inns on the road have apartments entirely papered with representations of all kinds of shameless debauchery, and these abominable pictures are known among the Chinese by the pretty name of 'flowers.'"

To the prevalence of infanticide, too, M. Huc bears testimony; although he is by no means so sweeping in his statements as some of the other writers on the subject. By some of the missionaries the practice is attributed to a superstition similar to that which is said to animate the Thugs of India. M. Huc ascribes it partly to the fearful pauperism, which may be said to be the normal condition of a large body of the population, partly to the universal

selfishness, and the absence of all the natural affections, that withering ἀστοργία, which now, as in the days of St. Paul, is the great characteristic of paganism, and which never fails to prove at once the accompaniment and the scourge of profligacy :

“For ah, it hardens a’ within
And petrifies the feeling.”

“As for ordinary infanticides—the suffocation and drowning of infants—they are innumerable, more common unquestionably than in any other place in the world, and their principal cause is pauperism. From the information we have collected in various provinces, it appears that persons in embarrassed circumstances kill their new-born female children in the most pitiless manner. The birth of a male child in a family is an honour and a blessing ; but the birth of a girl is regarded as a calamity, especially with necessitous parents. A boy is soon able to work and help his parents, who count upon his support for their old age ; the family is continued also by a boy, and a new link added to the genealogical chain. A girl, on the contrary, is a mere burden. According to Chinese manners, she must remain shut up till the period of her marriage, and she cannot exercise any kind of industry, by which she might make amends to her parents for the expenses she occasions. It is therefore the girls only that are murdered, as they are regarded as causes of indigence. In certain localities, where the culture of cotton, and the breeding of silk worms, furnish young girls with suitable occupations, they are allowed to live, and the parents are even unwilling to see them marry and enter another family. Interest is the supreme motive of the Chinese, even in cases where the heart alone ought to have influence.”—Vol. ii. p. 347-8.

It is a singular testimony, nevertheless, to the excellence of virtue and the superior merit of virginity, that, in the midst of this universal corruption, the natural instinct by which men are impelled to admire and honour chastity, even when they fail to imitate it, has made itself heard above all the stormy passions of this depraved people.

“We noticed on our way, a great number of monuments of a kind peculiar to China, and which alone would suffice to distinguish this country from all others ; namely, triumphal arches erected to widowhood or virginity. When a girl will not marry, in order that she may better devote herself to the service of her parents, or if a widow refuses to enter the marriage state a second time, out of respect to the memory of her deceased husband, she is honoured

after death with especial pomp. Subscriptions are raised for the erection of a monument to her virtue, to which all the relations, and even sometimes the inhabitants of the village or district where the heroine has dwelt, contribute. These arches are of wood or stone, covered with sculptures, sometimes very well executed, of flowers, birds, and fabulous animals. Many of the ornaments and fanciful mouldings would do no discredit to the artists who decorated our finest cathedrals. On the front is usually an inscription in honour of virginity or widowhood, as the case may be; and on the two sides are engraved in small letters the virtue of the heroine in question. These arches, which have a very fine effect, are frequent along the roads, and even in the towns. At Ning-Po, a celebrated seaport in the province of *Tche-Kiang*, there is a long street entirely composed of such monuments, all of stone and of a most rich and majestic architecture. The beauty of the sculptures has excited the admiration of all Europeans who have seen them; in 1842, when the English took the town, there was some talk of their carrying off these triumphal arches, and making with them a complete Chinese street in London. Such an enterprise would have been worthy of British eccentricity, but whether from fear of irritating the people of Ning-Po, or from any other motive, the project was abandoned."—Vol. i. pp. 21, 22.

The reader may possibly remember a similar monument of the triumph of purity in the midst of corruption, in one of the institutions of Japan, alluded to in a former article.*

With our knowledge of the prevalence of the revolting practice of infanticide, we are the less prepared for the almost incredible statements as to the number of the population. It has been very variously estimated by different writers. Father Arniot, in 1743, sets it down so low as one hundred and fifty millions, while Lord Macartney, in 1794, made it no less than three hundred and thirty-three millions. Père Huc carries the estimate still higher, the last census, as he assures us, having amounted to the prodigious total of three hundred and sixty-one millions. This vast multitude is diffused very unequally over the empire, the total extent of which (1575 miles long, and 1800 broad,) he computes at 2,835,000 square miles, or above eight times the surface of France. In some districts the population is so thin that you might almost fancy yourself in the deserts of Tartary. In others, the mere habitations seem so completely to cover the very surface

* Vol. xxxiii. p. 286.

of the land, that the traveller is puzzled to conceive what portion is reserved for cultivation, or how the bare necessities of life can be raised on a soil every fragment of whose surface appears covered with the dwellings of its inhabitants. The results of this fearful over-crowding are painfully felt in the periodical visitations of famine with which China is scourged. Not a year passes in which multitudes do not perish in one part or another of the empire, and "the multitude of those who live merely from day to day is incalculable. Let a drought, an inundation, or any accident whatever, occur to injure the harvest in a single province, and two-thirds of the population are immediately reduced to a state of starvation. You see them then forming themselves into numerous bands—perfect armies of beggars—and proceeding together, men, women, and children, to seek in the towns and villages for some little nourishment wherewith to sustain, for a brief interval, their miserable existence. Many fall down fainting by the wayside, and die before they can reach the place where they had hoped to find help. You see their bodies lying in the fields, and at the road side, and you pass without taking much notice of them,—so familiar is the horrid spectacle."

The author's picture of Chinese morality will prepare the reader for the exceedingly depraved and licentious tone of the popular literature. The novels, plays, ballads, and general light literature, are, for the most part, disgustingly loose and indelicate. And although the literary profession is held in the lowest possible repute, and, indeed, may be said to be ignored as a profession altogether, the number of these light ephemeral publications is very considerable. By a sort of poetical retribution the Chinese authors have made the western kingdoms the abode of the fabulous monsters which they delight to depict, as the western nations have generally drawn upon the east for the same purpose; and M. Huc tells us of burlesque books of western travel, like those of Gulliver, in which the heroes are Dog-men, with ears trailing upon the ground; others which describe a whole nation consisting only of women; and others, again, in which we find men with holes right through their breast, who, when they wish to travel, have only to pass a stick through this hole, and get themselves carried across men's shoulders; inasmuch that they may occasionally be met travelling in

this guise, two or three strung together upon the same pole!

Père Huc's observations on the Chinese language, and especially upon its written characters, are extremely solid and practical, and may be read with great interest, as the commentary of an experienced and practical scholar upon the ingenious essay of Mr. Andrews, the title of which is prefixed to this article. There is one observation of Père Huc which is quite decisive as to the *phonetic* value of the Chinese character. The missionaries have prepared little books for the use of their young converts, in which *the Latin responses* in the Mass, and other services of the Church, are actually printed in the Chinese character.

Corruption and sensuality are the besetting sins of the Chinese population; nor are these national vices anywhere more fatally displayed than in the official service of the public, and especially in the administration of justice. It is a strange peculiarity of Chinese legislation that all laws, even where their object is purely civil, are in a greater or less degree penal. Hence the power over the person and liberty, and even in many cases over the life of the subject with which the magistrate is invested in China, makes his office a most formidable one in the eyes of the public, and, in the corrupt hands in which it is commonly placed, an inexhaustible instrument of rapine and extortion. It would be painful to go into the details of this corruption which Père Huc's volumes supply. A single scene will show the formidable character of the machinery which the system places in the judge's hands. It was witnessed by Père Huc and his companion on an occasion similar to those already referred to, in which, disregarding the remonstrances of the officials, they insisted on forcing their way into the presence of the chief magistrate of a town in which they had been refused the privileges to which their credentials entitled them. The magistrate was actually engaged in a trial at the moment of their entrance.

"For ourselves, at the first glance we cast into the hall, we felt a cold perspiration come over us, and our limbs tottered under us; we were ready to faint. The first object that presented itself on entering this Chinese judgment hall was the accused—the person on his trial.

"He was suspended in the middle of the hall, like one of those lanterns, of whimsical form and colossal dimensions often seen in

the great pagodas. Ropes attached to a great beam in the roof held him tied by the wrists and feet, so as to throw the body into the form of a bow. Beneath him stood five or six executioners, armed with rattan rods and leather lashes, in ferocious attitudes, their clothes and faces spotted with blood—the blood of the unfortunate creature, who was uttering stifled groans, while his flesh was torn almost in tatters. The audience present at this frightful spectacle appeared quite at their ease, and our yellow caps excited much more emotion than the spectacle of torture. Many laughed, indeed, at the horror visible in our faces.

"The magistrate, to whom our coming had been hastily announced, rose from his seat as soon as he perceived us, and crossed the hall to meet us. As he passed near the executioners, he had to walk on the tips of his toes, and hold up his beautiful silk robes, that they might not be soiled by the pools of half-coagulated blood with which the floor was covered. He saluted us smilingly, and saying he would suspend the proceedings for a moment, conducted us to a small room situated behind the judge's seat. We sat down, or rather we fell, upon a divan, and were some moments before we could recover our composure."—Vol. ii. pp. 245-246.

The same reckless cruelty is exhibited even before trial.

"One day, when we were passing along the road leading to Peking, we met a party of soldiers, with an officer at their head, escorting a number of carts, in which were literally piled up a crowd of Chinese, who were uttering horrible cries. As we stopped to allow these cart-loads of human beings to pass, we were seized with horror on perceiving that these unfortunate creatures were nailed by the hand to the planks of the cart. A satellite whom we interrogated, replied, with frightful coolness; 'We've been routing out a nest of thieves in a neighbouring village. We got a good many of them, and as we had'n't brought chains enough, we were obliged to contrive some way to prevent their escaping. So you see we nailed them by the hand.'

"'But do not you think there may be some innocent among them?'

"'Who can tell? They have not been tried yet. We are taking them to the tribunal, and bye-and-bye, if there are any innocent men among them, they will be separated from the thieves.' The fellow seemed to think the thing quite a matter of course, and was even a little proud of the contrivance.

"Perhaps, what was most hideous of all in this dreadful spectacle, was the mocking hilarity of the soldiers, who were pointing out to one another with an air of amusement the contortions and grimaces of the miserable creatures in their agony of pain. If a people can exhibit such barbarity as this in quiet and peaceable

times, it may be imagined of what excesses they are capable under the excitement of revolution and civil war. In the provinces now in insurrection horrible abominations must be passing."—Vol. ii. pp. 269, 270.

There is one popular notion in reference to China, which Père Huc's work will go far to modify—the belief which prevails as to its social and political immobility. He shows by a comparison of Chinese history with that of other nations, and especially of France, that the revolutions which that empire has undergone far exceed in number and rapidity those of any corresponding period in the history of other countries. Between the fifth century and the seventeenth—a period of twelve hundred years—he enumerates no less than fifteen revolutions—not mere insurrections, the result of local or individual disaffection,—but complete and total changes of dynasty, accompanied by bloody and protracted wars, and generally ending in the utter extermination of one or other of the contending families. The most singular fact illustrative of this statement which he brings forward, is an episode of Chinese history in the eleventh century, in which an experiment precisely similar to the abortive *Ateliers Nationaux* organized in France, during the ephemeral popularity of Louis Blanc, in 1848, was actually carried into effect by a Chinese Louis Blanc, named Wang-nghan-che, and which, after convulsing the whole empire, and leading to the most fearful social results, terminated in a complete failure, and in the ruin and disgrace of its projector.

It would hardly be fair to close these interesting and highly instructive volumes, without giving the reader an opportunity of enjoying the author's narrative in its lighter and more entertaining views. We cannot afford space, however, for more than one or two extracts.

Having indulged ourselves somewhat at the expense of the natives of the Celestial Empire, it is but justice to let it be understood what are their notions regarding ourselves.

"The Chinese of the interior whom business takes to Canton or Macao, always go the first thing to look at the Europeans on the promenade. It is one of the most amusing of sights for them. They squat in rows along the sides of the quays, smoking their pipes and fanning themselves, contemplating the while with a satirical and contemptuous eye the English and Americans who

promenade up and down from one end to the other, keeping time with admirable precision. Europeans who go to China are apt to consider the inhabitants of the Celestial Empire very odd and supremely ridiculous, and the provincial Chinese at Canton and Macao pay back this sentiment with interest. It is very amusing to hear their sarcastic remarks on the appearance of the devils of the west, their utter astonishment at sight of their tight-fitting garments, their wonderful trousers, and prodigious round hats, like chimney pots,—the shirt-collars adapted to cut off the ears, and making a frame around such grotesque faces, with long noses and blue eyes, no beard or moustache, but a handful of curly hair on each cheek. The shape of the dress-coat puzzles them above everything. They try in vain to account for it, calling it a half-garment, because it is impossible to make it meet over the breast, and because there is nothing in front to correspond with the tails behind. They admire the judgment and exquisite taste of putting buttons as big as sapecks behind the back where they never have anything to button. How much handsomer they think themselves with their narrow, oblique, black eyes, high cheek bones, and little round noses, their shaven crowns and magnificent pigtailed hanging almost to their heels. Add to all these natural graces a conical hat, covered with red fringe, an ample tunic with large sleeves, and black satin boots, with a white sole of immense thickness, and it must be evident to all that a European cannot compare in appearance with a Chinese."—Vol. ii. pp. 102, 103.

Every one has read of the singular device of Floating Islands, to which the necessities of an over-crowded population have driven this ingenious and industrious race. Our travellers encountered a number of these curious structures in the course of their navigation of the lake Ping-hou, in the province of Hou-pe.

"We passed several floating islands, those curious productions of Chinese ingenuity, which no other people seem ever to have thought of. These floating islands are enormous rafts, generally constructed of bamboos, which resist the decomposing influence of the water for a long time. Upon the raft is laid a tolerably thick bed of vegetable soil; and, thanks to the patient labours of a few families of aquatic agriculturists, the astonished traveller beholds a whole colony lying on the surface of the water,—pretty houses with their gardens, as well as fields and plantations of every sort. The inhabitants of these floating farms appear to enjoy peace and abundance. During the leisure time which is not occupied by the culture of their rice-fields they employ themselves in fishing, which is at the same time a pastime and a source of profit; and often, after gathering a crop of grain from the surface of the lake, they

cast their nets and bring up a harvest of fish from its depths ; for these waters teem with creatures fit for the use of man. Many birds, particularly swallows and pigeons, build their nests in these floating isles, and enliven the peaceful and poetic solitude.

"Towards the middle of the lake we encountered one of these islands on its way to take up a fresh position. It moved very slowly, though there was a good deal of wind, and large sails were attached to the houses as well as to each corner of the island : the inhabitants, men, women, and children, lent their strength to aid its progress, by working at large oars ; but their efforts did not seem materially to increase the speed at which they moved. However, these peculiar mariners do not probably trouble themselves much about delay, as they are sure of sleeping on land, at whatever pace they may go. Their migrations are often without any apparent motive. Like the Mongols in their vast prairies, they wander at will ; but, more fortunate than these latter, they have constructed for themselves a little solitude in the midst of civilisation, and unite the charms of a nomadic life to the advantages of a sedentary abode.

"These floating islands are to be found on all the great lakes of China, and at first sight present an enchanting picture of happiness and plenty, whilst it is impossible not to admire the ingenious industry of these Chinese, so singular in all their proceedings. But when you consider the cause of their construction, the labour and patience necessary for their creation, by people unable to find a corner of the solid earth on which to establish themselves, the smiling picture assumes a darker tint, and the mind endeavours vainly to penetrate the future of a race so numerous that the land will no longer hold it, and which has sought a resting-place on the surface of the waters."—Vol. ii. pp. 96, 97.

Upon the same lake, too, they had an opportunity of witnessing the performance of the celebrated Fishing Cormorants of China.

"It is a curious spectacle to see these creatures engaged in fishing, diving into the water, and always coming up with a fish in their beak. As the Chinese fear the vigorous appetites of their feathered associates, they fasten round their necks an iron ring, large enough to allow of their breathing, but too small to admit the passage of the fish they seize : to prevent their straying about in the water and wasting the time destined for work, a cord is attached to the ring and to one claw of the cormorant, by which he is pulled up when inclined to stay too long under water. When tired, he is permitted to rest for a few minutes, but if he abuses this indulgence and forgets his business, a few strokes of a bamboo recal him to duty, and the poor diver patiently resumes his laborious occupation. In passing from one fishing ground to another, the cormorants perch

side by side on the edge of the boat, and their instinct teaches them to range themselves of their own accord in nearly equal numbers on each side, so as not to disturb the equilibrium of the frail vessel; we saw them thus ranged throughout the little fleet of fishing smacks on Lake Pinghou."—Vol. ii. pp. 100, 101.

We shall add one more fragment which, in addition to its own interest, has a fresh value for us in the present exhausted state of our fisheries, to the restoration of which it has begun to be applied with every prospect of success. It is curious to find that what among us is regarded as one of the newest triumphs of natural science, should have been in familiar use for centuries among this singular people.

"In spring a number of men go round the provinces selling spawn. Their establishment consists of a wheelbarrow loaded with barrels containing a thick liquid more like mud than anything else. It is impossible to distinguish the smallest animalcule in it with the naked eye. For a few sapecks you may buy a bowlful of this mud, enough to sow a large pond; it is merely thrown into the water, and in a few days the young come forth. When they have attained some size they are fed with tender vegetables chopped up and thrown into the water, the quantity being augmented as they increase in size. The growth of these fish is incredibly rapid. In a month at most they are strong and active, and require abundant nourishment. Morning and evening the proprietors of fish-ponds ransack the fields for suitable plants, which they carry home in enormous quantities. The fish rise to the surface, and throw themselves eagerly on their food, which they devour speedily, keeping up all the time a kind of murmuring noise, like a number of rabbits. Their voracity can only be compared to that of silk-worms just before spinning their cocoon. After being fed thus for about a fortnight they generally attain a weight of two or three pounds, after which they grow no more. They are then taken out and sold alive in the towns."—Vol. ii. pp. 382, 383.

On the all-absorbing topic of the present insurrection in China, which forms the subject of the interesting Essay of MM. Ivan and Callery, named at the head of our article, Père Huc's work contains no detailed information. From personal knowledge he was unable to speak, not having been present in the actual scene of the war; and he abstains from publishing the hearsay information which alone lay at his disposal. Nevertheless he enters, in his preface, at some length and with the same sagacity which distinguishes all his strictures upon Chinese affairs, into the

origin and prospects of the movement, and especially into its probable effects upon the religious and social destinies of the Empire. He makes it plain by a few sensible observations, that the silly anticipations in which certain Protestant journals had begun to triumph, anticipations of the christianizing or rather protestantizing tendencies of the insurgents and their leader, the adventurer, Tien-te, are utterly without foundation. He shows that, although in the proclamations they have paraded as a watchword the unity of God, and the abominations of idolatry, and have partially dressed up their fanatical manifestos in the phraseology of a sort of bastard biblicism, yet there is not a shred of Christian faith in their entire system of politico-religious belief. The semi-Christian notions which it embodies (but which are overlaid with the grossest superstition and blasphemy), Père Huc, with great appearance of probability, attributes, not to the diffusion of the Bible in later years by the agents of Protestantism, but partly to the Mussulman element which has been largely discernible in the movement, partly to the Christian books which have been compiled by the Catholic missionaries, and have been for centuries in circulation among the Chinese population, and of the general familiarity of the Chinese with which his own narrative supplies frequent and most convincing evidence.

As to the probable results of the insurrection he does not venture upon a decided prediction. But he is far from sanguine of any notable direct and immediate benefit to Christianity. On the contrary, he is rather disposed to look gloomily upon the future peace of the Church in China, no matter what may be the issue of the present contest. The Christians, he shrewdly observes, who have not taken any side in this contest, can hardly hope for favour with either of the parties in the event of its proving the victor. From the insurgents they have already experienced the most cruel persecution; probably enough stimulated by resentment at their holding back from the struggle, notwithstanding the appeal to their religious sympathies (evidently intended as such), contained in the first proclamations of the insurgent chief. With the present government, on the contrary, already sufficiently jealous, this very appeal of the insurgents will be an occasion of further jealousy and hostility against the Christians; nor is it by any means unlikely that their first success against

the rebels, may, especially in the remoter provinces, be inaugurated in the blood of the unhappy and defenceless Christians of the interior.

Nevertheless, even in the terrible contingency which he is thus forced to contemplate, as the result of the success of either of the two contending parties, Père Huc is not without his consolation. The great obstacle to the progress of Christianity in his opinion is the withering spirit of scepticism, indifference, and materialism with which the whole mind of China is infected. Hardly any possible new political combination can arise from which some improvement in this particular upon the existing stagnation of all religious feeling, and all ennobling or elevating sentiment, may not be anticipated. And it is through this intellectual inclination, and this alone, that he looks to the first great advance of Christian principles in China.

ART. VII.—*Descartes on Method.* Edinburgh: Sutherland and Knox; London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1852.

THIS is an ably-executed translation of Descartes' Discourse on Method. It affords us an opportunity of offering some remarks on a subject which has recently excited a good deal of interest among students of philosophy, and which to Catholic philosophers, especially, must be of the last importance.

The independence and supremacy of individual reason in philosophical matters forms a leading, we may say, indeed, the fundamental tenet of Descartes' system. It cannot be doubted that his speculations tended more than those of any man who had preceded, or who has followed him to effect a divorce between theology and metaphysical science, and a complete exclusion of the authority of the Church from the domain of philosophy. For bringing about this separation, it has long been fashionable to extol Descartes, and, among the enemies of religion

particularly, this is represented as the grandest achievement of his genius, the triumph of his life. The soundness, however, of a theory which, even in philosophical matters, makes individual reason altogether independent and supreme—competent of itself to direct man in the most arduous pursuit of knowledge, and to preserve him from error amid speculations as practically important to him as they are sublime and abstruse in themselves, has often been questioned; and, in our own time especially, a general conviction seems to prevail that it is at least extremely dangerous to attempt a solution of those problems on which Descartes so loved to speculate, without keeping our eyes steadily fixed upon the light of revealed truth, and our ears open to the teaching of the Church. It is worth while to examine the grounds of this conviction, and see to what extent the danger apprehended actually exists.

Whatever may be our opinion as to the wisdom or folly evinced in what are called philosophical pursuits, it is certain that they will always continue to engage attention, and to exercise an influence upon religion and social life. According to the peculiar turn of our mind, we may feel disposed to laugh at such pursuits, or we may have a predilection for them. One man will hold that they have not been too magnificently extolled by Cicero or Seneca; another that they are not too keenly ridiculed in Hudibras. But, at all events, no matter what may be our estimate of them, they will still be carried on. They are as old as thought itself; through all recorded time they have occupied the greatest intellects in the most polished nations, and unto the end men will not cease to inquire concerning the nature and attributes of the Almighty,—concerning the nature and destiny of the soul,—concerning good and evil—what is right and what is wrong.

Can such inquiries be safely conducted so as not to result in error, if we altogether put aside revealed truth, never looking to it or appealing to it for suggestion or correction, or help of any kind? Is the natural light of reason alone sufficient to guide us in the solution of such momentous questions without being aided by a single ray from any higher or more resplendent source. It is alleged as the chief glory of Descartes to have proclaimed that it *is* sufficient, and that philosophy can and ought to be utterly independent of revelation. Hence, those who hate

the authority of the Church delight to talk of him as a great deliverer, who was the first to succeed in breaking the theological fetters which had so long hung upon the intellect, and in awakening reason to a consciousness of its inherent strength and dignity. His countryman Cousin has exhausted eulogy in magnifying him as the "father of modern philosophy," "the emancipator who established modern freedom of thought," the leader who guided Europe from out of the house of bondage, &c. Though the disregard for revealed truth and the authority of the Church, which is a characteristic of modern speculation, may be and undoubtedly is traceable to the writings of Descartes, it would be singularly unjust to suppose that Descartes himself was not always careful to consult the Church, and submit to her direction. In the first place, he was scrupulously cautious that no theory which he propounded as a philosopher, should prejudice his faith as a Catholic. No one could have more emphatically expressed his conviction that the dogmatic teaching of the Church should be received with simple, childlike, unquestioning deference. In controversies connected with revealed doctrine, he admitted that authority was, indeed, supreme; and that there was no appeal from its infallible decisions. In all questions of this kind, he acknowledged but one judge, one witness, one sovereign mistress, one sole arbiter and rule of truth, namely, the Catholic Church. But, again, even in reference to philosophical matters, the whole life of this illustrious man (whatever may be said of the tendency of his theories) was a noble touching example of the respect due to authority, and of the influence which it is entitled to exercise over the most transcendent intellect. One of the wonderful thinkers of our own day has condescended to pity Descartes for the marked inconsistency between his principles and practice in this respect. He accuses him of timidity, vacillation, an inglorious shrinking from consequences, and so on; because, forsooth, after having written the *Discourse on Method*, and the *Meditations*,—after having sounded the silver trumpet of revolt from authority, and proclaimed the all-sufficiency and independence of reason, he himself still continued to look up trustfully to the Church, as a child to its mother, again and again professing his readiness to submit all to her revision. "*Nihil affirmo, sed hæc omnia Ecclesiæ Catholicæ auctoritate submitto.*" Nor can it

be disputed, that in determining the relation between authority and reason in philosophical matters, the example of Descartes was entirely at variance with his principles. As far as he was personally concerned, he was prepared to yield in all things to the Church; his proudest aim was to make his own conclusions square with her doctrine, and to exhibit natural reason, like the sybil, as confirming and illustrating, in its way, some portions of revealed truth. But the tendency of his speculations was widely different. The most signal result of the system which bears his name, was to accomplish a divorce between philosophy and authority. If men now venture, in propounding theories concerning the nature of God, and the destiny of the human soul, to ignore revelation, they allege that it was Descartes who taught them. If they proudly boast that in the solution of such questions it would be weakness to look for any other guide than individual reason, they say that the boast has been warranted by his principles. It was he, they tell us, who, in modern times, severed the ancient alliance between the Church and the schools of philosophy. They had long been united, as by a union of parent and child. Reason seemed conscious of its own waywardness and infirmity, and, accordingly, it ever appealed to the Church for help in its difficulties, for counsel in its doubts. Under the shadow of her wings it took refuge, as if there alone it could be safe from the arrow that fleeth by day, and from the business walking in darkness. But Descartes, we hear, came and effected in philosophical matters a change analogous to that which Luther brought about in reference to revealed truth. One taught that every man may construct for himself a system of faith, independently of the living authority of the Church; the other, that a man may, at least, construct a system of philosophy concerning God, the soul, moral duty, independently of revelation. Before proceeding further, we have one or two words to say on the subject of this parallel (which is a rather favourite one) between the German heresiarch, and the French philosopher.

Whether in the discussion of philosophical questions, even of those which relate to the nature of God, and the force and character of moral obligations, reason does or does not stand in need of authority, is not a matter of faith. Nor could the solution of the question, one way or the other, materially influence the controversy that

used to be carried on between Catholics and Protestants on the subject of private judgment. The truth of Christ's words is not dependent upon the admission or rejection of any particular method or system of philosophy; and He has declared that in matters of faith the authority of the Church is the only guide, the only rule. No one, therefore, should from seeing Descartes compared with Luther, and represented as having accomplished a revolution similar to that from which the Lutheran heresy has sprung, be seduced into a belief that, in a religious point of view, there was any sympathy, or affinity, or shadow of likeness between the two men. Such a supposition would be grievously injurious to the memory of Descartes, who would have shrunk from the idea that a Christian could revolt from the authority of the Catholic Church.

Again, the whole history of Descartes' life renders it certain, beyond doubt, that he never *intended* that the promulgation of his method should be made the occasion of discarding authority, even in philosophical matters. His willingness to obey the Church, and submit all to her decision, was evidently sincere, simple, unhesitating. His reliance upon the strength and capabilities of human reason sometimes amounts to extravagance; but there is not a single trait of his character which can be alleged as having anything in common with the insubordination and fierce turbulence of Luther. In fact, so far are the views of both men from being coincident, or in any respect substantially like each other, that in determining the legitimate sphere of natural reason, and the extent of its power therein, they are almost mutually contradictory. It is notorious that Luther and the early reformers sought to depreciate the influence of reason in the most unjust and arbitrary manner. Except, as a rule of faith for each individual, they would scarce deign to acknowledge its existence; all philosophy and philosophers were the object of their especial abhorrence. A respect for reason employed in the investigation of mere natural truth, would have been incompatible with Luther's theory concerning the effects of original sin; he held that after the fall of our first parents man no longer remained free; that his will no longer retained the power of choosing between moral good and evil; that his liberty became extinct. Thus, he tells us that a Christian is literally as incapable of controlling or regulating his own actions as if instead of

being a Christian, he had been a block of wood, or a piece of rock, or a pillar of salt, or any other lifeless, irresponsible object. Now, in this alleged extinction of liberty were involved, according to Luther, two primary defects; the one being a certain perversity of the will which hurried it irresistibly to embrace evil; the other a corresponding darkness of the intellect, which left that faculty liable to be the constant victim of delusion and error. Hence, reason was utterly powerless, and never to be trusted except as a rule of faith. But, in matters of faith, it was to supersede all authority. How marked is the contrast between this and Descartes' estimate of the capabilities and proper sphere of reason. Instead of denouncing philosophy, he attached himself to it with a devotion almost inordinate; it alone engrossed his attention throughout his entire life. Who has not heard of his vigils and meditations, of that vigour and enthusiasm in the "search after truth," which no difficulties could abate? The speculative tendency of his mind so strongly developed in his maturer years, began to evince itself when he was a young school-boy, at the Jesuit Seminary of La Flèche; even there, he was persuaded that reason, far from being always the victim of delusion, is competent to solve the deepest questions of metaphysics; and he would not be satisfied until his own reason should have completely solved them. With this view, he had, before attaining to manhood, actually examined and compared all the systems of philosophy then known in Europe; thinking that he did not find in any of them that for which he sought so eagerly—thinking that reason was capable of something better than the best of them, he went on to consult and study men as well as books. It was, perhaps, the intensity of his ardour in carrying out the design formed at school that made him, at one period, despair for a moment of accomplishing it; for we are told that he, at a time, tried to forget all his speculation and perplexities in the active duties of military life. But in vain, in the camp as in solitude, amid armed men, or in the society of students, in the service of Holland and of Bavaria, as well as in the quiet halls of La Flèche, the old ambition still clung to him and mastered him. There is not, we venture to say, a single name in the history of philosophy more remarkable than that of Descartes for earnest devotion to the study of purely philosophical

subjects, nor one which has contributed more to create an exaggerated notion of what reason can do in investigating them. So that in his estimate of the proper sphere and capability of reason, no less than in his reverence for the authority of the Church, Descartes was the very opposite of Luther.

But though Descartes' readiness to accept the dogmatic teaching of the Church could not have been more prompt or sincere than it was—though as far as he was personally concerned, he was, even in philosophical matters, prepared to submit all to her authority—though he never intended or foresaw that the method promulgated by him would lead to a divorce between philosophy and revealed religion, though the separation of the two is not perhaps a strict logical consequence of his method, yet it cannot be denied that the practical effect was to make reason as supreme and independent in philosophical speculations as if revealed truth had never been communicated. So far, only, if upon so slight an analogy one chooses to found a comparison, can Descartes be compared with Luther,—and having thus dismissed the parallel which certain parties in the English Church are fond of drawing between the men, we proceed to inquire whether individual reason may be justly regarded as supreme, all sufficient, and entirely independent of authority in philosophical matters. We maintain that it is not; and that in the discussion of questions connected with the nature of God—with the human soul—with moral obligation—it cannot ignore revelation without incurring great risk of falling into error on those important subjects.

To obviate misconception, it may be useful to explain our meaning somewhat more fully.

1. We have no wish to depreciate Reason, much less to follow the example of those who describe it as of itself incapable of arriving at a knowledge of any truth whatever without the aid of authority. It is finite, no doubt, but we are not therefore to exaggerate its incompetence; it is fallible, but not therefore in all things subject to delusion. We do not agree with those who would depress it too much, any more than with those who would too presumptuously exalt it—with those who would strip man of his noblest prerogative, and reduce him to the level of the irrational creation, any more than with those who would set him above archangels and make his intellect divine.

Every man experiences the *incredibilem veri noscendi cupiditatem*, and consequently every man must possess faculties capable of attaining it. In affirming this we would, of course, be understood as altogether prescinding from the controversy regarding the absolute necessity of instruction, of intercourse and communion of one kind or other with intelligent beings, the necessity of some *institutio aliena*, as a preliminary to even the most partial development of the powers of the human mind. This question we leave untouched. We speak of the capabilities of individual reason as it is found in persons enjoying the ordinary privileges of existence, not as it is found in fabulous wild men of the woods, like Orson, or in those forlorn specimens of our race whose history has been alleged in support of a well-known theory on this subject by Gerdil and Bonald. It has been argued by these illustrious writers that without some external aid, culture—instruction—the faculties of the mind—should remain for ever dormant, just as the eye would remain for ever sightless without moisture and light, or as the earth would be for ever sterile without the vivifying heat of the sun. Dr. Whately has recently adopted the same argument to demonstrate the necessity of an original revelation made by God to man. The conclusion arrived at by him in common with the two eminent philosophers to whom we have alluded, would be of the highest importance in determining the relation in which reason stands to authority; but as it is a conclusion still debated, we will forego the support that otherwise we might obviously derive from it. Whatever, then, may be the true theory on this subject, whether reason requires for its development some external aid and culture, or whether it would of itself, apart from all instruction, all intelligent guidance and direction, proceed in due course to frame judgments and construct arguments as an insect shakes off its chrysalis, as instinct teaches a bird to fly and a "bee to build its cells," we hold that whatever may be the orthodox solution of this question, individual reason is perfectly competent of itself, without any light from authority, to acquire a knowledge of an indefinite number of natural truths, and to distinguish them from falsehood with unerring accuracy.

Hence, though persuaded of the necessity of recognising the principle of authority in philosophical matters, we repudiate the theory which has given such a disastrous

celebrity to the name of l'Abbè Lamennais. Without taking the votes of mankind, and ascertaining what their verdict may be, every one's individual reason is quite sufficient to convince him of the truth or falsehood of numberless propositions. The contrary doctrine, notwithstanding the mass of ingenious sophisms by which the Abbè, throughout so many years of his life, tried to maintain it, is false and degrading, and involves consequences which soon earned for it the condemnation of the Church.

Hence, also, we entirely dissent from the early speculations of M. Bautain. For the genius and eloquence of that illustrious priest we have the most profound admiration; nor is this sentiment lessened by a consideration of the promptitude and docility with which, at the suggestion of the authorities in Rome, he has modified and emended the objectionable views first put forward by him. But these views did in truth approximate too closely to those of Lamennais, and were based upon an assumption that human reason, when abandoned to itself, becomes utterly helpless, an imbecile erring thing, always unworthy of confidence, or at best no more than the "power to *guess* at right and wrong, the twinkling lamp of life fooling the follower betwixt shade and shining."

2. In opposition to the celebrated theories of Lamennais and Bautain we have said that reason is exempt from the inherent deficiency and incompetence with which they would charge it, and that it is of itself, independently of an appeal to authority, (whether that authority be held, with Lamennais, to consist in the unanimous traditional belief of mankind, or, with Bautain, to reside in the more accessible tribunal of the Church,) perfectly capable of investigating and ascertaining truth. Without presuming to trace the exact sphere or define the limits of this capability, we hold, moreover, that among the truths which thus naturally come within the province of reason, and in the description of which authority would be irrelevant, are to be reckoned those which regard the existence of God and the evidences of Christianity. No metaphysical argument is required to prove this: *Invisibilia enim ipsius a creatura mundi per ea quæ facta sunt intellecta conspiciuntur; ita ut inexcusabiles sint.* (1)...*Cœli enarrant gloriam Dei, et opera manuum ejus annuntiat firmamentum.* (2)...*Vani autem sunt omnes homines in quibus non subest scientia Dei, et de his quæ videntur*

bona non potuerint intelligere eum qui est, neque operibus attendentes, agnoverunt quis esset artifex. In fact, if authority cannot be dispensed with in settling the elementary questions of natural theology, if individual reason be pronounced disqualified to examine or appreciate the evidences of revealed religion, nay, if it be not able to guide itself in making out the Church, so as to distinguish her with unerring precision as the one city upon the mountain, it is not easy to establish either the title which authority has to dictate, or the correlative obligation to listen and obey.

3. If, then, we are anxious to see renewed the old relationship which once subsisted between the Church and philosophy, it is not because we would undervalue what has been justly styled "god-like reason." It is a truly noble and glorious faculty, the best gift which, in the natural order, the Creator has bestowed upon man. Neither do we intend to convey that students should beset the porticoes of the church for the purpose of hearing lectures there on philosophical subjects. The Church of Christ has no direct concern with the progress of worldly knowledge, with the truth or falsehood of doctrines not divine in themselves or connected with the objects of her divine mission. She has been established but to execute the commands of her Founder, and He has left no mandate, open or implied, obliging her to look after the interests of science. She goes her way, and science and literature may go theirs. She has to deal, to be sure, with man's faculties, with his understanding, with his imagination, with his heart and affections, but with all for a purely supernatural end, and only with a view to the glory of God and the salvation of souls. We are as far, then, from holding that the Church has a title to dictate on matters purely philosophical, to settle controversies between the Academy and the Porch, between this or that rival school, as that reason is altogether inadequate to the discovery or apprehension of truth. As long as philosophy abstains from the discussion of questions which have been decided by a supernatural revelation, the Church possesses no right to control it, check it, or call it to task. With regard to scientific inquiries as such, whether physical or psychological, she is simply indifferent; and whatever influence she may exercise over the prosecution of them is always accidental and indirect. But if philosophy chooses

to enter upon a sphere in which the Church is supreme, if it should choose to tread upon ground already preoccupied by her, if it should undertake to pronounce upon questions that have been already answered by a divine supernatural revelation, then we hold that it is a duty, as well as a right of the Church, to look after philosophy, and if she should find it opposing, or throwing doubt upon, or trying in any way to create antipathy or indifference to the revealed word of God, to rebuke philosophy, to denounce its inference, and discountenance the methods which it employs in establishing them. Hence the science, by whatever name we may call it, which professes to solve upon natural grounds, by arguments drawn from reason alone and independent of revelation, the great questions which relate to the Being and Attributes of God, to a future life, to human liberty and moral obligation, is one which, in as far at least as it deals with these subjects, the Church may and ought to take cognizance of. She can no more tolerate an error on these matters, because merely natural arguments are adduced to support it, than if its author put it forward as a revealed dogma. She cannot permit Condillac to teach fatalism, because he pretends to derive that doctrine from the principles of Locke, any more than she can permit Calvin to teach it on theological grounds. Whatever contradicts revealed truth the Church places her ban upon, whether reference is made to the Bible or merely to reason, in support of the contradiction. Hence every Catholic will admit that if false doctrines concerning God, or moral duty, be proposed for acceptance under the name of philosophy, the Church has a clear right to pronounce them false and to warn her children against them, while, on the part of her children thus warned, there exists a correlative obligation to renounce and avoid them. So far, then, the position in which metaphysical science stands towards the authority of the Church is indisputable, if it should promulgate a false theory on the momentous questions alluded to, it instantly becomes amenable to her tribunal.

No Catholic will deny that philosophy, or science, or metaphysics, or whatever name we may bestow upon it, is thus conditionally subject to the revision and controul of the Church. If it should lead to error concerning the nature of God, or the essential character of moral duty, the Church, as the depository and infallible interpreter of

revealed doctrine, is competent to condemn the error and define the opposite truth. It may be asked, however, whether, even admitting this hypothetical subordination of science to authority, we may not securely go on speculating upon the attributes of God, upon morals, upon a future life, as if the Church had never been established, nor a divine revelation given; whether individual reason is not capable itself, irrespective of all aid derived from revelation, of avoiding error on these matters; whether individual reason may not, therefore, undertake to study and discuss them as it enters upon the study of the elements of Geometry, where it is as certain of arriving at the right conclusion merely by its own strength, as if the same conclusion had been revealed in every chapter of the Bible. This we take to be the true issue raised by the promulgation of Descartes' method. Whatever may have been the intention of its author, it spread a new idea throughout Europe, that the authority of the Church is as irrelevant in speculations connected with the soul and its Creator, as in the investigation of the plainest properties of triangles. It did not place metaphysical science in direct antagonism to theology, but it divorced it from it, and proclaimed that it might be independent of it. In the mediæval times it had been understood that he who undertook to speculate upon the divine attributes, or to examine his own soul's nature and destiny, set out upon a journey on which he should be sure to meet many bye-paths that natural curiosity would fain explore, many cross-roads with finger-posts that seem to point to opposite directions. Difficulties might arise to impede him, or allurements tempting him to stay. Where there were so many windings and branch-ways it was considered hard to direct one's steps aright. This traveller might, without perceiving the digression, strike in upon a path which, though pleasant and inviting at first, soon leads to a place where sudden darkness falls upon him, and he can see but a deep chasm yawning at his feet. Another is attracted by some fair vista, it may be a round-about, but he will go by that way; it abounds in flowers; there is bright sunshine, and sweet fragrance, and therefore he will proceed by it. In short, it had been apprehended in the old time that there were a thousand chances of the traveller's being led astray. It had been well known, and universally acknowledged, that the greatest men of the ancient world,

the demigods, had, age after age, attempted this same journey, and had, one and all, uniformly missed the way. If acuteness, sagacity, boundless knowledge, could have accomplished the thing, who could dare hope for more distinguished success than Aristotle; and for strength or expansiveness who would presume to place his own in comparison with that calm, lofty, massive intellect, which the ancients used to call 'divine?' And yet Plato and Aristotle, the renowned wise men of Greece, an innumerable host of others, whose names are heard in every part of the world, as convertible with all that is great and pre-eminent—in fact, the long list of the worthies and sages of antiquity, each of them in turn had tried this journey we talk of, and had diverged from the right path. The best of them never succeeded in getting securely to the end. There still stand the ruins of the Porch, there still are the withered groves of Academe, the monuments of their failure. The melancholy result of their labour was, professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and they changed the likeness of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things. Previously to the time of Descartes, Christians had been taught to read in the gross errors of these singularly-gifted deep-thinking pagan philosophers a significant lesson; they were told that natural reason, if abandoned to its own resources, could scarce be considered more penetrating, more profound, more reliable in their own days, than was the reasoning power of Aristotle or of Plato; they were constantly admonished of the dangers and difficulties which necessarily beset those who would ascertain by mere logical argument what precisely is the nature of God, and would penetrate the essence of Him who far excels all else; for if you look to greatness, He is grander—if you look to beauty, He is fairer—if to sweetness, He is sweeter—if to splendour, He is brighter—if to power, He is stronger—if to mercy, He is kinder. Accordingly they were directed to proceed in their speculations concerning the attributes of the Supreme Being with humility and caution, they were recommended to avail themselves of the assistance which God Himself had given them in a divine revelation on these very subjects, which science undertakes to deal with, and they were forewarned that error and impiety would be the consequence of disre-

garding it. Hence the mode of conducting philosophical studies was based upon a principle fundamentally different from that introduced by the method of Descartes. Revealed truth was formerly to the philosopher what the chart and the beacon-light are to those on sea; by it he always shaped his course, without it he would not commit himself to the treacherous waves; guided by it, whether his progress might be slow or rapid, he was sure to be safe, and where interests so important to a Christian were at stake he freely preferred safety to adventure. Now the practical result of Descartes' method, however foreign to the views of that illustrious man himself, was to sever this connection which had existed between philosophy and authority, ready to embark with confidence in any speculation upon the most sublime and awful subjects, just as it would set about solving a problem in algebra, prepared to encounter all the perils of the sea, trusting exclusively to itself, as if the chart of revealed truth had been never drawn, nor the beacon-light ever kindled.

We are persuaded that in the study of God, and of our own nature and destiny, individual reason is not thus independent of revelation, and that if the two be divorced, the divorce will inevitably terminate in hostility and collision. We do not care to call in the aid of any *à priori* psychological argument to establish this position, we will allow it to rest mainly upon the history of opinion since the time, that Descartes' method was first promulgated. Let us learn from that what have been the doctrines concerning God, the soul, moral duty, most popular among those who disregarded the authority of the Church, and who professed to trace their conclusions to Cartesian principles. The character of these doctrines, and of the metaphysical principles from which they are deduced, will be quite sufficient to enable us to judge whether reason is in reality possessed of the marvellous powers which men attribute to it, and whether it can, on these subjects, afford to overlook revelation. We are thus to examine the question proposed merely from a single point of view, and even our survey of the history of speculation since Descartes' time must itself be extremely rapid. To deal adequately with a subject like the present, much more to exhaust it, would require not only ampler space than the limits of a periodical can afford to it, but also more leisure and learning than we can devote to its discussion. As

the controversy, however, regarding the relation in which authority and reason stand towards each other in philosophical matters, is in this country a novel one, and as there may be found some well-meaning inveterate Cartesians who will sharply dispute the position which we have advanced, we think it right to forewarn them that they must not estimate the real strength of that position by the restricted means which a writer in a review is obliged to employ in its defence. It is a just observation, however common-place, that by which preachers, whether from modesty, or with deference to a worn-out rhetorical artifice, sometimes preface their discourses, and entreat their hearers not to judge of the cause they advocate by the arguments actually brought to bear in sustaining it. In a single paper no man could deal with a subject such as the present otherwise than in a circumscribed, meagre, and, if you wish, superficial way. We have, therefore, deemed it expedient not to let an issue so important go before our Catholic readers, without enabling them to see that the view which we have been putting forward, however inadequate our vindication of it may turn out to be, so far from being novel or singular, has always been recommended by the Church, and insisted upon by some of the most learned of the fathers. Accordingly we submit the few extracts following, not so much as a logical proof to confirm or establish our opinion concerning the insufficiency of reason, *per se*, in certain philosophical matters, as in the hope of removing from the minds of some of our Catholic readers all misapprehension and misgiving with regard to its correctness.

Tertullian pointedly says, that those who teach philosophy, trusting to reason alone, are the *patriarchs* of heresy. St. Hilary's testimony on the present subject is unequivocal and decisive. "Non est de Deo humanis judiciis sentiendum; a Deo *discendum* est quod de Deo intelligendum sit, quia non nisi autore cognoscitur." Origen writes thus:—"Quomodo Deo credere non sit rationi consentaneum majis, cum in fide *omnia humana* pendeant?" St. Justin reviews the systems of philosophy which had been prevalent in his own time—he points out their cardinal defects—he dwells upon the perpetual dissensions and shallow wrangling of the Sophoi—he ridicules the pretentious folly of those who overlook the authority of the Church, and trust to the all-sufficiency of

human reason, and accounts in this way for the absurd notions entertained by the wisest of the ancients, when they undertook to speculate upon the attributes of God, and on the nature of moral obligation: "Quod in peritis discere noluerint, sed sese existimaverint mentis humanæ solertia claram celestium rerum cognitionem assequi posse, cum ne terrestrium quidem potuerint." And he concludes by contrasting the corrupt rival theories propounded by the wise men of Greece, who had entirely overlooked revelation, and trusted only to the dictates of natural reason, with the purity of doctrine transmitted by those who had not refused to be guided by the light of revealed truth. "Quocirca cum veri nihil de religione a doctoribus vestris (the Greek philosophers) præcipi posse constet, et idoneum satis documentum nobis ignorationis ipsi suæ per dissidentes inter se factiones exhibuerint, reliquum esse opinor, ut ad majores nostros revertamur, qui et magistros vestros longe tempore anteverterunt, et nihil de suis ipsorum cogitationibus et placitis docuerunt; minime ipsi mutuis dissensionibus invicem conflectentes, aut alii aliorum dicta evertere in animum inducentes; quippe qui omni contentionis studio et factionum dissidio liberi, sicuti a Deo acceperunt, ita nobis doctrinam tradiderunt." Clement of Alexandria tells us emphatically that we cannot avoid error if we dispense with authority in the solution of philosophical questions, "Quia ostensum est principii universorum esse eam quæ fide habetur scientiam." If, Theophilus of Antioch proclaims, in every department of life we are compelled, as by a necessity of our nature, to take many things on trust, how then, he asks, can we refuse to form our judgment on those sublime and abstruse matters which regard the nature of God, in accordance with the revelation which God Himself has been pleased to give us? "Non animadvertis actiones omnes antecedere fidem, Quis, cedo, agricola metere potest nisi prius semen credit sulcis? Quis mare poterit trajicere nisi prius semetipsum credat navi et gubernatori? Quis morbis implicitus, sanitatem recuperare poterit, nisi semetipsum prius credat medico. Quam artem, quam scientiam quis discere poterit nisi prius semetipsum tradiderit et crediderit præceptor. Si igitur agricola credit telluri, navigaturus navi, infirmus medico, tunc refugis teipsum credere Deo." St. Augustine's book, "*De Utilitate Credendi*," was written mainly with the design of establishing the principle

of dogmatic authority in matters of faith, but everywhere throughout the work he lays down clearly enough that in philosophical discussions also, which regard the nature of God, it would be extremely perilous to make reason independent of revealed truth.

We have now cited an amount of testimony sufficient to indicate the view entertained by the Fathers on the subject we are examining; they certainly did not make the same lofty claims for individual reason, which in our time have been so vehemently urged in its favour. They would, if the occasion had demanded it, have each and all discountenanced and reprobated the arrogant folly of those who would have us imagine that reason becomes degraded when it seeks counsel from the Church. They would each and all have declared that reason cannot be proclaimed independent of the Church, unless we are prepared to see independence eventually growing into opposition and defiance. And who has failed to remark the extent to which this proud spirit of defiance manifests itself at the present moment? In the allocution of our Most Holy Father, Pius IX., pronounced in secret consistory so lately as the 9th Dec., 1854, he describes the prevailing tendency to exaggerate the capabilities of human reason, and place it on a level with religion, as one of the most fatal errors of our time, and as entailing some of the heaviest evils which the Church has recently had to deplore. "*Sunt præterea, venerabiles Fratres, viri quidam eruditione præstantes qui religionem munus esse fatentur longe præstantissimum à Deo hominibus datum, humanam nihilominus rationem tanto habent pretio, tantopere extollunt ut vel ipsi religioni æquiparandam stultissimè patent. Ita quidem rejecta Ecclesiæ auctoritate, difficilimis, quibusque, reconditesque quæstionibus latissimus patent campus, ratioque humana infirmis suis confisa viribus licentius excurrrens turpissimos in errores lapsa est. qui in religionis et civilis rei detrimentum, illudque maximum redundarunt. Atque hujusmodi humanæ rationis sectatores, seu cultores potius, qui eam sibi certam veluti magistrum proponunt, ejusque ductu fausta sibi omnia pollicentur, obliti certe sunt quam grave et acerbum ex culpa primi parentis inflictum sit vulnus humanæ naturæ quippe quo et obfusæ tenebræ menti, et prona effecta ad malum voluntas. Hinc celeberrimi ex antiquissima ætate philosophi quamvis multa præclare scripse-*

rint, doctrinas tamen suas gravissimis erroribus contaminant." Some of the worshippers of human reason will of course characterize this declaration as the latest attempt made by Rome to fetter the intellect, and abolish freedom of thought. They will talk of the folly of endeavouring in this enlightened century to set up a reign of despotic authority on the one side, and of blind uninquiring submission on the other. But surely a Catholic will not be moved by all their lofty speeches and vehement outcries. Athalia may rush into the temple, and at sight of the lawful king she may rend her garments and cry treason, but the people of God will not be influenced in their choice by any display of dramatic rage; they will take such phrases as enslaving the mind for what they are worth, and though they should be assailed by a thousand cries of treason they will acknowledge the King's Son, and they will place the crown upon him, and the testimony, and give him the law to hold in his hand. They will never consent to abandon entirely to reason the settlement of questions which have been already decided by a divine revelation.

It is a somewhat curious fact that those who are most clamorous in asserting the independence and supremacy of individual reason, and who protest most vehemently against the influence of authority, would scarce consent to have the doctrine for which they stand up so stoutly, carried out in any other practical affair of life, except the important affair of religion alone. If, in legal matters, an irreversible decision had once been issued by a supreme court, who would overlook it, and stake his property in a precisely similar case upon the advice of a lawyer, however subtle and ingenious, who is known to disregard all precedents, and to trust entirely to the first principles of his science? If under a certain form of government the people are sure to continue happy, and prosperous, and free, who would tolerate an experiment in political metaphysics that would ignore the constitutional law and history of the country, and make each successive administration rule it according to their own peculiar set of first principles? It is the same with regard to the science of healing; let a really successful mode of treating a disease be once made known, and what practitioner will dare to forget it, and trust his reputation to first principles? And yet we are told that though God Himself has condescended

to give us a means of avoiding error in the most important subjects that can engage the attention of man ; it is perfectly safe, prudent, nay, a duty to set aside those means, and confide unreservedly to first principles. Why not say boldly at once that a wrong conclusion concerning the Nature of the Divine Being is *not* an affair of such great moment ? Why not proclaim that it is an evil of less tremendous magnitude to hold any one form of Pantheism, than to suffer loss of property, or be open to a charge of professional or administrative incapacity ? And surely it is not because those questions which relate to the attributes of God, involve less mystery, or are beset with less difficulty than questions appertaining to the ordinary business of life, that we can afford in the examination of them to dispense with the salutary aid which has been placed within our reach. Take any one of the doctrines which form the usual matter for metaphysical discussion, and see how unaided reason will deal with it apart from revelation. Take, for example, the doctrine that the world has been created. We are taught to believe that the Almighty not only arranged the universe, and established the order and harmony thereof, but that by His word He produced the very material of it. Until He spoke it had not existed at all,—neither the form nor the matter,—neither in the rude mass nor arrayed in its present harmony and grandeur.

This is an elementary doctrine known to every Catholic child who has come to the years of understanding ; but what was the notion on the same subject entertained by the “worshippers of human reason” renowned in antiquity ? One great sage tells us that the world had always existed, and that the order seen in it had sprung from a generative principle within itself, and this principle was no more or less than moisture. Another gravely informs us that this view is correct, except that instead of assigning moisture as the enforming principle, we should assign heat. A third proclaims that the principle is neither moisture nor heat, but number. A fourth solemnly declares that this world is not the work of gods or men, but was, and is, and shall continue to be, an ever-living fire. Now, to a Christian, who has been listening to the true doctrine on this subject from childhood, and on whose mind a thousand unperceived influences have contributed to impress it as a familiar, and as it were, household

thought, such theories as the above will sound strange and unmeaning; and he will probably be led to say at once that his own reason could do something better,—that he would never dream of falling into such absurdities. But if individual reason of itself be now capable of something better than was the reason of Thales or Anaxagoras, the same superiority will scarce be claimed for the mental powers of a modern philosopher compared with those of Plato. And yet it seems that the idea of the world's creation but once dimly crossed Plato's mind, and the nearest approach which he made to truth on the question was, that matter had not been produced, but in the beginning spontaneously presented itself to the Divine Artificer to be moulded by His hand. Thus the real character of the relation in which God stands to the universe had scarce ever occurred to a single man among all the deep thinkers and acute reasoners of antiquity; much less could the most transcendent mind come by its own powers to a right conclusion concerning the true nature of the divine attributes. Imagine a philosopher who professes to ignore revealed truth, trying to reconcile the permission of evil with infinite sanctity and goodness, reasoning about a Being enduring for ever, yet never older, never younger—an Indivisible Presence which fills the whole universe, and yet is complete and entire in every part of it,—a Will perfectly free, and yet exempt from the possibility of change. Let the strongest intellect proceed to speculate upon such subjects, trusting to reason alone, resolved honestly to push first principles to their extreme limit, not caring a jot for the doctrine which has been revealed to the Church on the same subjects, whether it be opposed to, or in accordance with the conclusions of stern logic, we will not say that it is impossible for it to avoid error, but it assuredly incurs an imminent and dreadful risk of falling into it.

In further proof of the incapability of reason (without the aid of revealed truth), to deal adequately, or even securely with such abstruse questions as we have been referring to, we might dwell at much length upon the numberless errors and inconsistencies and contradictions which may be daily and hourly laid to the account of that faculty. Is it not, moreover, proverbially difficult to find two men, even the most enlightened as well as the most candid, concur in taking the same view on any topic? Nay, how

often does not the same man change and reverse his own best weighed judgments and most deliberate conclusions? At all events, if we listen for a moment to those who are fond of pronouncing eulogies upon the power and dignity of reason, we shall find that they most commonly speak of it as 'an abstract, impersonal kind of thing, and not as it actually appears in individual men, inheriting each his own proportion of the weakness, the passion, the prejudice of his race. They speak of it much in the same way as you hear men speak of the beauty and symmetry of the human form; what they so much extol is in truth a certain type or standard of their own conceiving, not at all the figure which actually walks by on the streets, and which, as the case may turn out, is sometimes tall, sometimes short, sometimes lean, sometimes bloated, sometimes athletic, sometimes worn and weak, sometimes whole, sometimes maimed, &c. Descartes' method has long appeared to us to rest upon an assumption that man's intellect is more excellent and perfect than it is in reality. He claims for it an inherent strength and innerrancy which experience proves that it does not possess. Overlooking the infirmities which actually beset it, he would fain invest it with ideal dignity and power. The darkness which original sin left upon it, the influence of pride, of prejudice, of association, habit, of these and such like obstacles to a secure and thorough investigation of truth, he either makes no account at all, or imagines that they are mere accidents, from which a disciplined philosophic mind may enjoy a complete immunity. *Cato bene sentit, sed loquitur tanquam in republica Platonis, non in fæce Romuli.* This tendency to exaggerate the natural force of the intellect is sometimes strongly, indeed, we may say, ludicrously illustrated in Descartes' own speculations; it betrays itself even in the discourse on method, which, from its aim, should have been a model of severe analysis. Every student of philosophy is acquainted with the process by which Descartes alleges that he arrived at a satisfactory solution of that mysterious, ever-recurring question, so often asked and never answered, namely, what is the foundation of knowledge, the ultimate guarantee of conviction—the ultimate test—criterion—proof—assurance—of truth? He tells us that he began by a resolution to doubt about everything—even about what had previously been regarded by him as possessing the most indisputable

claims to assent; he would take the whole frame-work of his mind to pieces, and not admit the existence even of the fragments; all that he had known or believed from childhood upwards, (his faith as a Catholic alone excepted) he would look upon as a tissue of groundless prejudices; his intellect was to be reduced to the condition of a mere *tabula rasa*, in which he would leave neither axiom nor postulate, premiss nor conclusion; nay, further, no stray association should be allowed to retain a lurking place in memory;—there was to be neither hope nor fear, pleasure nor pain, nor emotion nor passion, but the “*je pense*” was to stand alone in the soul, more solitary than the last man amid the universal wreck of things. In alluding to this celebrated analysis we do not care to repeat the taunting criticism of Gassendi; but the analysis, it seems to us indicates a confidence in the power of man’s mind over its own thoughts, which is scarce warranted by experience. Is any man really capable of going through such a mental process, as that by which Descartes declares that himself was enabled to discover the true starting point of philosophy? Is any man really capable of reviewing the different items which compose the sum of his knowledge, and of seriously persuading himself that they are all false or doubtful? Is any mind, however powerful, however severely disciplined and inured to habits of concentration, capable of dealing so despotically with itself and its own thoughts? One may abstract, may fix his attention on a single point, and direct his collected energies to the consideration of a single question, but to discard all our knowledge as false or doubtful, and be convinced ourselves that it is so, we hold to be an undertaking little less difficult of accomplishment than an attempt to blow away the atmosphere which surrounds us. Descartes’ method of arriving at the “*ego cogito*” appears in its way to be much the same as if he had had recourse to a surgical operation on the brain, for the purpose of establishing that laughable theory which he advances with such solemnity and confidence about the residence of the soul in the conarion.

But it was not in taking the initial doubt to be of such singular facility that Descartes’ reliance on the strength and capabilities of individual reason most glaringly betrays itself. It is when he sets about accounting *a priori* for the order and design of the universe that his presump-

tion, for so we must call it, becomes painfully conspicuous. How much thought, how much toil, how many years of patient inquiry, were necessary to give us the little knowledge of nature which we possess? There was the great book open from the beginning to the inspection of mankind, and who has ever yet, after the most assiduous attention, succeeded in reading a single page, so as to understand its full meaning? Suppose one man to enjoy all the advantages derivable from the accumulated experience of ages, and to have combined in himself all the knowledge acquired by observation, or experience, or induction, how far would he not be from comprehending the plan of the universe? But Descartes absolutely maintained that he not only understood that plan, but that he could himself have suggested, originated it; out of his own brain, without model or pattern of any description, he could weave a scheme of the universe, not merely as beautiful, as harmonious, as perfect as the present,—but he would undertake to devise one identical in every respect with the present, precisely resembling the present in all things from the relative position of the stars down to the tints of the flowers. Did we not know that Descartes was far from intending it irreverently, we should characterize such audacity as profane. The wisdom displayed in the works of creation has ever been looked upon as divine, and no human intellect can fathom, much less rival or compete with it. But Descartes, in his overweening reliance upon the power of reason, would have undertaken of himself to suggest the order of the heavens; he would have entered into the depths of the sea, and walked on the lowest parts of the deep; he would have made a weight for the winds, and weighed the waters by measure; he would have given a law for the rain, and a way for the sounding storm. In the whole history of science we remember nothing so sublimely ludicrous as Descartes' earnest, coolly-spoken invitation to his readers to accompany him to chaos, and be witnesses of the successful way in which *he* should proceed to the construction and arrangement of the world,—how *he* should establish the laws which govern it, and provide for their permanent harmonious operation. And be it observed, that for accomplishing this he required no exemplar, no archetype, in short, no other data beyond the "*ego cogito.*" Out of this magical "*je pense*" he would evolve a complete

design of the universe, just as Pascal is said to have deduced nearly a book of Euclid from a single axiom which he chanced to have overheard from his father,—or as Cuvier could faithfully sketch the organization, and estimate the dimensions of, a Saurian from the fragment of a tooth, or a stray vestige left by the tip of its tail.

The Cartesian demonstration of the existence of God is almost as celebrated as the Cartesian doubt, and illustrates significantly enough the danger to which, in metaphysical pursuits, the acutest mind may expose itself, when it ventures to trust implicitly to its own resources, overlooking the landmarks which traditional authority may have erected for its safe guidance. Descartes was not satisfied with the argument for the existence of a Supreme Being, founded upon the marks of design which are displayed in the universe. How could he, indeed, have accepted it, holding as he did that he could himself have accounted *a priori* for the number and magnitude and relative position of the stars, that he could have marshalled the hosts of heaven, and guided the earth in its orbit,—that he could have bound together the Pleiades and stopped the turning of Arcturus. In fact, according to the Cartesian system, our acquaintance with the existence of the external world, and, therefore, with the harmony of design which characterizes it should, in the order of strict logical sequence, follow and not precede our knowledge of the existence of God. Without presupposing the veraciousness of the Deity, it would, from the Cartesian point of view, be impossible to establish the existence of an external world. Hence a rigid demonstration of the existence of God was to form the key-stone of the new philosophy; without it we could not be scientifically certain of more than one or two elementary propositions; without this the chain of Osiris would remain for ever broken, and no hand could bind it. The preliminary argument was to be not only the basis of philosophy, it was, moreover, indispensable to theology, and without it the evidences of revealed religion would lose all their force. Addressing the Sorbonne on this subject, Descartes, in the Introduction to the *Meditations*, observes, “I have always been of opinion that the two questions respecting God and the soul were the chief of those that ought to be determined by help of philosophy rather than of theology; for, although to us, the faithful, it be suffi-

cient to hold as matters of faith, that the human soul does not perish with the body, and that God exists; it yet assuredly seems impossible ever to persuade infidels of the reality of any religion, or almost even any moral virtue, unless first of all these two things be proved to them by natural reason." The justness of this remark is clear and incontrovertible. Before it becomes imperative to accept revealed truth, an infidel must not only be convinced that the source from which it emanated is worthy of respect, but that it is divine, and from the nature of the thing entitled to all homage and obedience. This conviction it is impossible for him to have, unless he may be previously persuaded in some way or other that God exists,—nay, it is impossible without at least some vague notion of the divine nature and perfections. Hence Descartes could not but feel that in his system a great deal was made to depend upon the validity of the arguments which should be adduced to demonstrate the existence of God. In point of fact, he maintained himself that all certainty depended upon it,—that if it failed we could not proceed a single step in the discussion of natural truth, or in examining the evidences of revealed truth, and that in short it was the only answer to scepticism—the only breakwater against a universal deluge of doubt and infidelity. It is no wonder, therefore, that he speaks of it with so much confidence and complacency. "But I treated the first and chief (the arguments for the existence of God) in such a manner that I should venture now to propose them as demonstrations of the *highest certainty and evidence*. And I will also add that they are such as to lead me to think that there *is no way open to the mind of man by which proofs superior to them* can now be discovered." Simple people are fond of imagining that the evidence of God's existence, as seen in the works of creation, forces itself upon the mind—that it almost anticipates argument, and that it is impossible for any one who is not an idiot to be unconvinced by it after a moment's reflection. Indeed, we believe that such evidence is found everywhere, and in everything, in the lowest flower of the field no less than in the stars of heaven, in the organism of the meanest insect no less than in the noblest form and most glorious intellect,—in the teeming life that animates a single drop of water, as well as in the magnificence of a thousand suns and a thousand systems. It is not, how-

ever, upon the argument from the marks of design, from the traces of infinite wisdom and power which everywhere pervade the universe that Descartes proceeds; he even tells us that this argument must be regarded as a fallacy—a *petitio principii*, unless the existence of a Deity is first incontestably established by the argument which *he* suggests. And now, what is the value of this famous Cartesian argument, so much spoken of, so much vaunted, and involving consequences so momentous,—that if it be set aside its author fancies that the search after truth is vain—that nothing remains for us but scepticism and intellectual despair? It is well known that St. Anselm of Canterbury is commonly reputed to be the first metaphysician who proposed it, though Suarez remarks that St. Anselm was certainly indebted for it to a passage in the writings of St. Augustine. Whether Descartes borrowed it from St. Anselm, or the Schoolmen, or whether by a strange but happy coincidence he originated it for himself, it is an argument which, if not for its intrinsic force, at least because of the venerable names associated with it in the history of philosophy, is doubtless entitled to some consideration. We will not, therefore, presume to say that it is a palpable sophism, the more especially as, by a very slight emendation it may be reduced to the form of the ontological argument for the existence of God, which is at present put forward with such singular emphasis by some of the most profound Catholic thinkers, and in some of the most distinguished Catholic Schools of the Continent. But when we recollect that it had been examined and rejected when St. Anselm first proposed it, by the most penetrating mind then or since employed in the service of the Church—if we turn it over ourselves, and make it the subject of our meditation, we shall find it so hard to appreciate it—to get over the suspicion that there is a fallacy lurking in it, though we may not be able to detect and clearly point it out; if we listen to the pronouncement of all the modern schools peremptorily discarding it, and studiously drawing a distinction between it and what might seem to be a similar argument used by some of themselves; and if on the other side we revert to the prominent position which it holds in the Cartesian system—the high irresistible evidence on which it is there said to rest, and the all-important consequences which are there made to depend upon its validity, we shall discover in

the history of this single argument quite enough to convince us how easy it is for the most sagacious intellect, when left entirely to itself, to mistake an uncertainty for "the highest certainty and evidence," to urge a fallacy for a demonstration more cogent than which "the mind of man cannot discover,"—and this on a subject which was understood to involve the best interests of religion and science. We might go on to adduce almost every one of Descartes' peculiar doctrines and views to show the peril of confiding too unreservedly in the direction of individual reason—determined to follow, wherever it may lead, over the wide sea of thought, without caring to seek for other guidance, or to consult the chart of revealed truth. If the Cartesian method be right—if the capabilities of reason be such as that method assumes them to be, is it not strange that scarce a single tenet or idea which the great philosopher could claim as his own has been able to withstand the test of time? The columns of the temple which he erected, and which was to last for ever, affording beneath its expansive dome a meeting-place for all the jarring sects and schools, have long since fallen and crumbled. His vaunted proof for the great dogma of a future state, and the immortality of the soul is universally rejected; it is not fit to convince an unbeliever—or to bear the slightest examination. It is less ingenious, and less solid than the proof for the existence of God. His theory concerning the origin of ideas (for, notwithstanding the authority of Sir William Hamilton, we must say, *cum pace tanti viri*, that Descartes *did* hold the doctrine of innate ideas,) was demolished by Locke, and is completely exploded. In fact, Descartes' claims to intellectual sovereignty, even in that department of knowledge in which himself thought his pre-eminence most secure, are admitted to rest entirely upon the peculiarity of the method which he invented. The application of that method, in his own hands, was almost always a failure. It would not be well for him if the inherent soundness of any one of his speculations, or their value in the aggregate, should be taken as the measure of his genius. Among his most zealous admirers and partizans, it is not denied that if mankind be at all indebted to him, it is rather because he induced them to depart from the beaten track, because he gave a new impulse and a new direction to thought, than because of his actual success in the

establishment of known truths, or in the discovery of truths not known.

While thus animadverting upon the failure of the Cartesian method, as applied by the great man who first promulgated it, we do not forget that the history of science records numberless instances of a similar kind—where a new principle, which was afterwards to be made available in achieving the most extraordinary triumphs, had been either misapplied, or proved totally inefficient in the hands of its discoverer. In mechanics, in astronomy, in chemistry, the men who were the first to point out the right path, were not always the most successful in following it. Scientific truth does not become complete at once—it has its seed-time and its harvest, its twilight and its noon-day. We shall therefore be told perhaps that it is unfair to take Descartes' own application of his method as a test of its soundness—that if we are determined to estimate it by its results, we should extend our inquiry and ascertain its influence upon the speculations of his followers—and of his school. And who, it may be further asked, are those followers,—who are the most distinguished disciples in the school of Descartes?—Will a Catholic writer take exception to their arguments or doctrines in reference to the Divine Attributes, or on either of the other two questions we have been all along speaking of? This is the philosophical school, is it not, whose opinions were adopted and vindicated by men whose memory is revered for holiness and learning throughout the world—and whose names are identified with the glory of the Church in France? Who could take the place of Bossuet, as watchman in the towers of Israel, or accuse him of want of vigilance in guarding the purity of faith; and for deference to authority, who could look for anything more beautiful and touching than the submissive spirit of Fenelon? And yet were not those, and a thousand others conspicuous for piety and zeal, devoted adherents to the philosophical views of Descartes?

Now, this is a line of observation in itself quite just, but altogether irrelevant if it should be advanced in defence of the Cartesian method, not as that method might possibly be interpreted and turned to good account in Catholic hands, but as it has since Descartes' time been usually understood in the popular schools of philosophy. In advertent to its failure, when applied by Descartes himself,

we had not forgotten so elementary a lesson as that the author of a new principle may not always attain complete success in its development. But this, as we take it, is a truism rather in the history of physical science than in natural theology. In the one, the law for obvious reasons is progress, as each new experiment and each fresh discussion afford additional data for arriving at a knowledge of truth; while in the other, if we abstract from what has been made known to us by revelation, the means of coming to a correct solution of any one problem, are scarce more enlarged at the present day than they had been two thousand years ago. It is for this reason that we have not considered it unfair to test the Cartesian principle by the use which its author himself made of it,—he having all the facilities for correct speculation possessed by the most favoured of his disciples, and the philosophic temperament being scarce less strongly marked, or the power of logical analysis less strikingly developed in him than in his successors. In truth, if the questions concerning God and the soul were in reality to be determined by individual reason alone, we hold that Thales or Anaxagoras, not to speak of a modern philosopher like Descartes, were quite as competent to appreciate the value of an argument on the subject as, let us say, a professor in the London University.

For the rest, we are not insensible to the merits of the illustrious men who rose up as stars in the French Church during the seventeenth century, and who have left behind them a trail of glory and of light for ever. But they, we maintain, and indeed the matter is obvious, never consented to ignore the authority of the Church in philosophical discussions. They always assume the revealed doctrine as the only true one; and then, where reason could in anywise confirm it, they made natural reason work well in the service of the Church. Accordingly, we shall find that the conclusions arrived at on the same subject by other men, with intellectual gifts scarce inferior, but who cared not to be guided by revelation, stand out in melancholy contrast to theirs. We shall not dwell here upon the systems of philosophy which Spinoza and a host of others professed to have evolved from the Method of Descartes; but we shall be content with allowing a rapid review of the leading philosophical schools which have grown up since Descartes' time, and which have

commanded public attention at home, and on the Continent, speak each for itself, in illustration of the principle of ignoring revealed truth in philosophical matters.

The Sensational School, as it has been called, may be regarded as the first which appeared in an independent and definite shape, to arrest our attention. In the history of philosophy it extends over a lengthened period, and occupies a conspicuous position. Locke is generally reputed the founder of it. The leading tenets of the school, however, as well as the principles on which they are based, had been broached and discussed by Hobbes, but being avowedly used by him as subsidiary to the re-establishment of views inimical to the interests of religion and society, they failed for a time to obtain popularity or consideration. Bacon, too, had been sounding the trumpet and preparing the way for the introduction and triumph of this school. Though he nowhere openly declares that the senses alone constitute the source of all our reliable knowledge, the tendency of his speculations and the weight of his authority, if they are not too clearly on the side of that opinion, may at least be easily perverted to foster and propagate it. The Sensationalists, at all events, have been fond of quoting the sarcastic dictum from the *Organum*, and applying it to what they looked upon as the airy, abstract, fruitless subtleties of their opponents: "*Pro desperanda autem habenda est causa veritatis cum ad talia inania deflectit.*" It is certain that the opinions formally propounded by Locke, and elaborated by him into a compact definite system, had long been ripening in the minds of men devoted to philosophical pursuits,—and we fancy that we are not far wide of the truth in saying that it was in no small degree owing to this circumstance, namely, that his views appeared in an auspicious conjuncture when they were but a reflex and expression of thoughts which had been already familiarly pondered over, that the celebrated essay became so famous. In the work itself, we look in vain for depth, or originality, or for any of the traces of a profound masterly intellect, unless, perhaps, such traces are to be found in a steady acuteness, always sharp as a blade, but accompanied neither by the brilliant imagination, nor graceful style which distinguish other worthies who rank far below Locke in the estimation of his countrymen. Locke himself did not profess to be a thorough-going

Sensationalist. Our knowledge, he maintained, was traceable to a double source—the senses and reflexion, both of which exercised a co-ordinate independent influence in the formation of it. But to suit the spirit of the time in which he wrote, it was expedient to dwell exclusively upon the first of these two elements, and Locke accordingly either does not allude at all to the share which reflexion has in the formation of our knowledge,—or he brings the matter out in so lame, inconsistent, self-contradictory a way, that his disciples, urging his principles to their legitimate consequences, justly inferred that we are indebted for all knowledge, properly so called, to the senses alone. Hence they would abolish the distinction between necessary and empirical truth, or rather they would altogether ignore the former, contending that whatever transcends experience is unsusceptible of scientific proof. Locke maintained that our idea of space is had through the sense of sight and touch,—our idea of solidity from the touch alone;—so also our idea of substance, of power, and cause, is had through the senses. If this be the way by which we come to have these ideas—if this be an adequate analysis of their origin—if they be but mere fragments of our experience, it is plainly illogical, a mere arbitrary assumption, to attribute to them when they occur in propositions, universality, or necessity. Whatever has no higher warranty for its truth than experience—whether individual experience, or the traditional experience of mankind cannot, it is obvious, be *therefore* assumed as *necessarily* and *universally* true. Yet Locke did with singular inconsistency assume propositions to be at once necessary and universal. He takes it as an axiom that every thing must have a cause,—he holds that no single particle of matter can be annihilated by any finite power,—he insists upon the *necessary* truth of geometrical propositions,—he lays it down that the resistance arising from solidity is absolutely insurmountable. If his own account of the origin of our knowledge that is derived from experience alone be the correct one, then surely he is not entitled to make such assertions. He should have written as a salvo after each of them—as far as *our experience justifies us in saying*—*as far as we have tried*. We have no instance of a change without a cause,—we have no *example* of a particle of matter annihilated by any finite agency; and so on; but beyond this we cannot venture to give a decision—

we have nothing but experience to guide us about the absolute possibility or impossibility of the thing; it would not, therefore, become us to speculate upon it. It was some such line of argument as this that was adopted by Locke himself when he maintained that the human soul, with all its powers and faculties, with its subtle thoughts, its imagination, its liberty, could not be proved to be an immaterial substance, and that there is no repugnance in the supposition that it is but an animated clod. In the discussion concerning the nature of the human soul as known to us by the light of reason, Locke, for once, did not swerve from his principles; and his disciples with a degree of consistency which could scarce have been prompted by his example, were resolved to carry those principles still further. Condillac was the ablest as well as the most intrepid of all his followers. Assuming the correctness of Locke's theory, that the senses are to be regarded as the exclusive source of our knowledge, he adopted a curt, pointed, emphatic way of stating the entire doctrine. In a sentence that has since become celebrated for terseness and comprehensive meaning, he declared that "all ideas are but transformed sensations," and insisted that this was the true authentic exposition of Locke's views. In plainer words, he advocated a system of undisguised materialism; he held it to be an inevitable corollary from the teaching of his English master and guide, that there was no more a spiritual principle in man than in a statue, nothing in short but delicately wrought fibres, and an elaborately contrived organization. Such is the historical origin of a school of Philosophy, from which, in modern times, the Church, the depository of revealed truth, has suffered much. It rose up a cold, unsightly hideous thing, its evil mission being to make war against faith. It stood in the highways, blaspheming God and His holy religion, proclaiming night and day that the world was but a vast self-arranged machine, containing within its own bosom the springs of such order and harmony as it exhibited,—that it was frivolous to talk of a Supreme Intelligence—of a Providence—of a hereafter—of any thing that we cannot see or touch. In this school Hume was the foremost man—Hartley and Priestly belonged to it. Helvetius and Lord Shaftesbury dictated its ethics; D'Alembert, in the Introduction to the Encyclopedia, became its champion when a temporary reaction seemed to set in against it,

and with the aid of his colleagues restored its popularity in France. In our time the recognised exponent, and most celebrated advocate of the doctrines of this school is M. Auguste Comte. By the most competent judges it is held that he has not pushed the principles of the school beyond the limits to which he was justified in urging them, and that his system of positivism, as he has been pleased to designate it, is no more than a strict logical development and intrepid application of a theory for the author of which Englishmen have often twined garlands, and chanted hymns of praise. The first volume of M. Comte's *Cours de Philosophie Positive*, appeared in 1830; the second was published five years afterwards, others followed in 1838, and subsequently. The design which the writer modestly proposes is to remodel society in its manifold relations and aspects; and science is the means by which he would accomplish this regeneration. All the sciences, he maintains, whether physical or social, or religious, are to be treated as branches of one science, and are therefore to be investigated on one and the same method. He then proceeds to state that the history of each department of knowledge is marked by three distinct progressive phases, that is, every science passes through three different states,—it is first *theological*, secondly *metaphysical*, then in its last and perfect state it becomes *positive*. The theological period corresponds with the infancy, that is, with the extremely rude unenlightened condition of mankind, the metaphysical stage represents its youth, but the grand era of positivism inaugurated by M. Comte, coincides with its mature age, and grave deep-thinking manhood. In the theological period, he goes on, men knew not how, to be content with observing phenomena as they appeared—they should trace effects to causes, they could not account for the way in which the world came to be clothed with beauty and order—and how it is that its harmony has been preserved unbroken from the beginning but by the supposition that there must be a Supernatural Intelligence who planned the whole, and an Almighty hand that guides and preserves it. This was the untutored infancy of the human intellect, ere genuine science had yet scarce begun to dawn upon them. Men were then simple enough to admit the existence of God, to fear His wrath, and imagine it was a terrible thing to fall into His hands. The metaphysical period, according to M.

Comte, is a decided advance, and affords palpable indications of sounder thought and superior enlightenment when compared with the theological. In this epoch, the existence of God, or of any supernatural agency is not insisted upon; but a remnant of the old theological prejudice still distinguishes it, and induces the speculator to seek for occult natural causes, for abstract forces, real entities, and so on, and to substitute these for the Deity. This mode of proceeding also argues a certain weakness and immaturity of intellect; it shows that science was still in the chrysalis, though rapidly approaching to the term of its transformation. It was reserved for M. Comte to usher in the new era, to be the guardian of philosophy at a time when, having discarded the fanciful conceits of youth, and risen above the vain, restless curiosity of childhood, it should walk upon the earth, scaring error and superstition before its awful brow. In this new system we are not to believe in the existence of God, as a Supreme Being, distinct from or elevated above physical nature; we are not to believe that the soul of man is a spiritual substance, as that phrase is commonly understood by Catholics; we are not to believe in a hereafter; we are not to believe in the existence of moral duty, or at least, that moral duty springs from the high source to which it is referred by the Church. M. Comte himself tells us with an undisguised air of triumph that on Sunday, the 19th of October, 1851, he closed a course of lectures in the Palais-Cardinal, after a resumé of five hours in this fashion: "*Au nom du passé et de l'avenir, les serviteurs théoriques et les serviteurs pratiques de l'humanité viennent prendre dignement la direction générale des affaires terrestres, pour construire enfin la vraie providence, morale, intellectuelle, et matérielle, en excluant irrévocablement de la suprématie politique, tous les divers esclaves de Dieu, comme étant à la fois arriérés et perturbateurs.*" In confirmation of the doctrine in favour of which M. Comte urges this extraordinary appeal, he confidently refers each of his hearers and readers to his own individual experience. "There is none of us," he says, "who, looking back upon his own personal history, does not at once remember that in childhood he admitted the existence of a Deity; in more advanced youth he became a searcher after occult natural causes to explain phenomena, but that in ripe manhood, he denied both the one and the other. And the man," he adds, "who cannot

verify this from his own recollections *is not up to the level of the time.*"

Now, we know that from such blasphemous rhodomontade as this a Catholic mind will recoil with instinctive horror. A Catholic will say that it should scarce be transcribed, if the very statement of it were not an abundant exposure of its absurdity. How, he will ask, could such a doctrine be patiently listened to for a moment? What danger that it should ever secure a favourable reception among men, brought up from childhood as Christians? Who can tolerate it? Would it not rob us of faith and sweetest hope? It would not only remove God to an inaccessible distance from His creatures, but it would leave them no God, no Redeemer, no Providence, no Father, with His divine ears ever attentive to receive their petitions, and His bountiful hand ever open to supply their wants, and surround them with blessings. Besides, it may be remarked, is not a theory of this kind as extravagant and ridiculous as it is impious? It is no less a libel upon common sense than an impotent effort to overthrow religion. If the Church had never been established, or if her voice were silent for ever, who could fail to see through such transparent nonsense? Revelation is not required to set one right in this affair, it is too grossly, too revoltingly absurd; it comes from the same school whence have issued those insane declamations concerning society, progress, the heart and pulse of humanity, et cetera, which have provoked the laughter of the whole world.

Yes, but these same insane demon-inspired oracles have also occasioned copious and bitter tears. Everywhere there are sad traces and painful recollections of their evil influence. It is well for those who, led by duty, or taste, or accident, or from whatever cause, to an acquaintance with such philosophical theories as the one we have now spoken of, are enabled to pursue the study of it at the feet of our holy mother, the Church. With her light beaming upon us and around us, with her kind voice whispering in our ear, the *monstra erroris* cannot hide their deformity. In her company, we are sure not to stray from the right path. Like the heavenly guardian sent to direct Tobias, we shall ever find her, when we want to be directed, beautiful, standing girded, and, as it were, ready to walk. And she knows the way that leadeth to the country of the Medes, and hath often walked through all the ways thereof, and

she will conduct us safe, and bring us again safe. But it would be a grave mistake to suppose that persons outside the Church take the same view of these matters as ourselves. We should hope that there are few professing to be Christians, who, if the practical *conclusions* of such a theory as Comte's were markedly stated to them, would not instantly reject them. But a student of philosophy is obliged to go through a certain preliminary routine before he comes to hear of the conclusions. He first studies the principles, and it is not easy to disprove clearly the principles advocated by Locke in his great essay. He finds that they have been taken up and defended by illustrious men, and that they have been sustained by arguments in which he cannot perceive a flaw. He goes on to examine some of the propositions deduced from them; the logical process is perfect, he must accept the propositions also. He comes at length upon a complete philosophical system like Comte's. We have no less an authority than Dr. Whewell assuring us, though he has no sympathy with Comte's views, that they are in the main evolved conformably to the most rigid laws of analysis from the principles of Locke. What, then, shall our youthful student do? He has been taught to ignore the Church and revealed truth in philosophical questions; he cannot, therefore, fall back upon revealed truth to check the wrong inferences he has been drawn into; he cannot, like a Catholic, appeal to that standard which would at once inform him, that however acute and specious the reasoning, the conclusion must be false and impious.

Those who fancy that the very absurdity of certain doctrines is a sufficient guarantee that they cannot become popular, who think that a man's good sense will instinctively reject them, and that no ecclesiastical or theological aid whatever is necessary to shield the mind from their influence, are at times apt to forget that such doctrines are commonly proposed for acceptance in a plausible, dazzling, insidious fashion. They are scarce ever advanced in the direct, plain, open way, which might be likely to make a Christian turn from them at once with abhorrence. And as they are seldom stated only in a dry formal manner, so they are never abandoned to the support of mere school logic. Every branch of science, and every walk of literature, are gradually made to illustrate them and contribute to their diffusion. The design is not that the evil

thing should appear suddenly in its deformity, and alarm conscience, but that in due course it should insensibly arrest attention, soften, win, fascinate. Hence it soon puts off the unsightly vesture of the schools, and assumes all beautiful and attractive forms; it speaks to us in grand, lyric words; it is embodied in pleasant, graceful fiction; it inspires eloquence, that fills the young mind with rapture; it is backed by a coalition of grave sarcasm and laughing wit; it lays claim to universal knowledge, and talks loudly of having submitted everything to severe proof; it is the only true friend of liberty and humanity—nay, of religion; it will regenerate the human race; and, in short, make those who taste of the fruit which it points out, to become as gods. When Catholics hear of the preposterous, debasing doctrines, which have, from time to time, obtained popularity among masses of men, they can scarce explain the phenomenon in any other way than by supposing that the mind, as well as the body, is subject to the influence of sudden, unaccountable epidemics. Or, rather, a Catholic looking at the practical consequences of such a philosophical system as we have been considering, is like a man who reads of the commission of gross crime, but cannot realize to himself the motives, the character, or force of the temptation which led to it. It never, therefore, perhaps, occurs to him that if he had himself been placed in the same circumstances, and assailed by the same temptation, he, too, instead of wondering how such a crime could have been thought of, might not have likewise fallen into it.

The principles of the Sensational School, though for a long period in the ascendant outside the Church, were occasionally combated even by men who did not think religion paramount to philosophy. In England, where, as we have seen, the school had its birth, it encountered from the commencement some learned and distinguished opponents, among whom we may mention Clarke. In France its popularity first began to decline in a marked way under the covert attacks of Laromiguière, who professed to be a disciple of Condillac, and since his time it had been steadily falling into disrepute—owing, in some measure, to the denunciations of Ampère and Cousin—until Comte brought his boundless knowledge and undoubted genius to aid in its revival.

But inside the German circles, the system never ob-

tained a great or permanent success ; if discussed there at all, it was only to be set down as an ignoble form of materialism, something alien to the national mind, a theory with which it was impossible for a true German to sympathize. From the university of Königsberg there issued, towards the close of the last century, another theory, based upon principles not merely different, but almost opposite, which was to supersede it at least for a time, and which, in its turn, was to be the creed of the Sophoi of Europe. We are told by Kant that his design in the "*Critic of Pure Reason*" was to refute the empirical scepticism of Hume. He held that Hume's analysis of the way in which we come to have our ideas of active power and cause, had never been fairly met, nor a satisfactory explanation given of the origin of those ideas. "Since the essays," says Kant, "of Locke and Leibnitz, or rather since the origin of metaphysics, as far as their history extends, no circumstance has occurred which might have been more decisive of the fate of this science than the attack made upon it by David Hume. He proceeds upon a single but important idea in metaphysics, the connection of cause and effect, and the concomitant notions of power and action. He challenged reason to answer him what title she had to imagine that anything may be so constituted, as that if it be given, something else is also thereby inferred ; for the idea of cause denotes this. He proved, beyond contradiction, that it is impossible for reason to think of this, *à priori*, for it contains necessity, but it is not possible to perceive how, because something is, something else must necessarily be, nor how the idea of such a connection can be introduced *à priori*. I freely own it was these suggestions of Hume which first, many years ago, roused me from my dogmatical slumbers, and gave to my enquiries quite a different direction in the field of speculative philosophy.....I first enquired, therefore, whether Hume's objection might not be a general one, and soon found that the idea of cause and effect is far from being the only one by which the understanding, *à priori*, thinks of the connection of things, but rather that the science of metaphysics is altogether founded upon these connections. I endeavoured to ascertain their number, and having succeeded in this attempt, I proceeded to the examination of those general ideas, which I was now convinced are not, as Hume apprehended,

derived from experience, but arise out of the pure understanding. This deduction, which seemed impossible to my acute predecessor, and which nobody besides him had ever conceived, although every one makes use of those ideas, without asking himself upon what their validity is founded; this deduction, I say, is the most difficult which could have been undertaken for the behoof of metaphysics; and what was still more embarrassing, metaphysics could not have offered me the smallest assistance, because that deduction ought first to establish the probability of a system of metaphysics. As I had now succeeded in the explanation of Hume's problem, not merely in a particular instance, but with a view of the whole power of pure reason, I could advance with sure but tedious steps to determine completely, and upon general principles, the compass of pure reason, both what is the sphere of its exertion, and what are its limits, which was all that was required for erecting a system of metaphysics upon a proper and solid foundation." The change which Kant effected in mental philosophy, he himself proudly compares to the reform which Copernicus introduced in astronomy. Copernicus happily reversed the mathematical traditions concerning the motion of the heavenly bodies, and setting out from the hypothesis that this motion is apparent and not real, he promulgated a system of great beauty and simplicity, which fully explained all the phenomena that an astronomer undertakes to account for. A similar revolution was required, according to Kant, in order to produce a genuine philosophical system, a system of complete symmetry, and alone capable of demonstration. Accordingly, he begins by asserting that those ideas which constitute the foundation of metaphysical science cannot be shown to have any reality, any objective existence corresponding with them, and that they are purely subjective, *a priori* forms of the mind. Such are our ideas of possible and impossible, of infinite and finite, of cause and effect, of power and action, of the relation of numbers, of time, of space, of necessary and contingent, and so on. These ideas cannot be derived from experience, otherwise they should neither be unvariable nor universal. But though not derived from experience, they are not antecedent to it, and therefore not to be considered innate in the sense in which the doctrine of innate ideas has been attributed to Descartes. In point of time they

begin with experience, though they arise not from it, but from the mind itself. Whenever, then, a proposition has the character of universality and necessity, it must have received this character from the mind. We have no other guarantee that it is strictly necessary and universal than because the mind imparts to it that character. From the mental faculty, therefore, not from absolute objective truth and reality, this proposition, for example, every change must have a cause, derives its universality and necessity. Its truth, therefore, as a general proposition, is only apparent, we are not warranted in assuming that it is absolute, real. It is the same with all other propositions that have the character of necessity and universality, and, of course, with the conclusions deduced from them, their truth cannot be known as objective, absolute, real truth, but only as apparent and subjective. The intellect does not create the objects which it apprehends, but it induces upon them a certain form, certain conditions of its own making; it stands towards them in a relation somewhat analogous to that in which the eye views the many-coloured rainbow, every tint of which we imagine to hang above us in the heavens, though science tells us that its glorious hues are all in the eye, and arise out of its peculiar organization.

This is, in truth, the basis on which the entire of Kant's doctrine rests. It is, in many respects, different from idealism, particularly the idealism advocated by Berkley. The philosopher of Cloyne admitted the reality of things, and our capability of knowing them. Kant insists that we can know nothing, as it is *in se*, that we cannot, *e. g.*, know whether every change must have a cause, but only that it seems so to us, and if the mind were not constituted as it is, it might seem otherwise. Berkley did not hesitate to recognize the existence of noumena, on the contrary, he maintained that the mind stands face to face with them, perceives them immediately, and requires not the interposition of what are called sensations, ideas, intelligible species, or of a representative object of any kind to apprehend them. Kant retains the distinction between noumena and phenomenon, between truth *in se*, and truth *in ordine ad nos*; the latter only can we be certain of, but of the former we must for ever continue uncertain. Berkley's theory, at least in his own hands, is unquestionably dogmatic. Kant's so evidently leads to scepticism, that its

author himself was compelled to acknowledge that, in order to establish any proposition, we must abolish science and fall back upon credulity. In fact, Kant, though he professes to have set out chiefly with the intention of vindicating the principles of human knowledge from the attacks of Hume, comes to a conclusion virtually the same as that of the English philosophers; one says that our idea of cause and effect is to be traced to a habit of the mind, the other, that it arises from a law or form of the mind, but both equally deny our capability of knowing whether it be *in se* true that every change must have a cause.

It will be asked if a system of philosophy based upon such a foundation as this could have ever occupied the serious attention of rational creatures—could have ever succeeded in moulding opinion or conciliating sympathy—above all, if it could have ever had a practical influence upon the religious views of thinking men. It only opens, some one may say, an arena for the subtle weaving of cobwebs—not the ground on which the lynx-eyed enemies of faith would take their stand for battle. Who, outside his own lecture-hall at Königsberg, cares for the strange jargon, the uncouthly-worded paradoxes of Kant? Who has not common sense enough, without at all hearkening to the voice of the Church, to reject them?—nay, the man has no appreciation of the ridiculous, who can refrain from laughter at the old sophist's oracular air—his grotesque robes and cabalistic phrases. Well, it is not good to take the bread of the children and to cast it to the dogs. There is no better attested fact in history than that where divine faith has been abused,—those who forfeited the precious gift have been uniformly led, sooner or later, into the most monstrous, and to a Catholic, almost inconceivable errors on matters connected with the Nature of God, with moral duty, and a future life. The principles of Kant's philosophy may seem to us an outrage upon reason itself; but if we recollect that these principles furnished the basis on which was to be constructed a system of theology and morals, we may feel less surprise at the wide popularity to which they attained outside the Church. At all events, in whatever way we may account for the phenomenon—however intensely we may wonder at it, a system did grow up from those principles, and was permitted in the economy of Providence to lead astray a whole people—to

penetrate beyond the country which gave it birth, and win adherents among men of the acutest intellect,—to have everywhere in Europe its lecturers, its poets, its essayists, its fictionists—and to become the only religion admitted by thousands of cultivated minds. Some of our well disposed, enlightened Catholic countrymen, who imagine that the Church may at times be rather sensitive about the faith of her children, and inclined to exaggerate the dangers that beset it—would probably think that a philosophical theory like Kant's, might, without let or hindrance, be submitted for study or discussion to the judgment of any young man at the university,—and, in fact, in the absence of every theological corrective, be safely left to refute itself. We will take the liberty of briefly citing for them the criticism pronounced on Kant's psychological speculations, by one or two illustrious writers, who would scarce be less impatient of a glaring absurdity than these same Catholics, and who would certainly not be less slow in detecting it. Cousin, observing on the general character of Kant's philosophy, the great fundamental tenet of which we have fairly placed before the reader, introduces the subject in this way. It was reserved for Germany—that country distinguished for deep thought and meditation,—the country which had produced Leibnitz and Wolf, to give to Idealism its true representative and exponent in the eighteenth century; this representative is the illustrious Kant. Kant, as well as Locke, is a disciple of Descartes; his speculations are stamped with the same general character, and proceed on the same method as Locke's,—this character and this method being, in fact, the distinctive mark of modern philosophy. With a firm hand he separated philosophy from theology,—he made consciousness the starting point of his analysis,—and in this only did he differ from Locke, that the one takes the origin of our knowledge to be sense,—the other à priori ideas or forms of the mind.

Kant is indisputably the founder of a rational psychology. Madame de Staël tells us that “at the period when Kant's ‘Critic of Reason’ was published, there had been two current systems of philosophy—the sensational and the ideal. Between these reason went on habitually straying till Kant undertook to define the boundaries of the two empires—of the senses and of

the mind—of the external and internal worlds. The intellectual power which he manifested in tracing these limits, had perhaps been unequalled among his predecessors." It would be easy to collect a volume of panegyrics pronounced upon Kant by the savans of different countries, but the most unequivocal evidence of the value set upon the principles of his philosophy, is to be found in the enthusiasm with which they were taken up, and made to give a colour to every department of German science and literature. Kant himself, though he did not publish the "Critic" until after his life had been far advanced, lived to see a disciple, or, proselyte to his views, in almost every university chair in his native country.

If a Catholic is unable to appreciate the fundamental principles of German philosophy, he will probably be still less tolerant of their development and application in the hands of Kant's followers. The theories propounded by Fichte, Jacobi, Schelling, Hegel, each of whose names stands at the head of a separate and independent school, are scarce of a character to compensate, in a religious point of view, for the sceptical philosophy of Kant. The creed of them all consists of but one dogma, however differently they may word it, or attempt to establish it, and that is Pantheism. In a future number we propose, if the subject should be worth resuming, to place before our readers a more detailed account of their respective systems, as well as of that propounded in France by M. Cousin. For the present we must be content with observing that all the great modern Schools of Philosophy set up on the principle that individual reason is independent of authority, are, in spirit, and the tendency of their doctrines, one and the same as the ancient schools of Alexandria. The best of them do, in fact, glory in reproducing the very theories which Julian the Apostate delighted to ponder over, and which he opposed so vehemently to the simplicity of the Gospel. They cannot succeed now any more than they did then, for the truth of God remains for ever. Nay, in the character of these schools, and in the manner in which they have come to supersede almost every other form of religious error, Pantheism being, according even to such a writer as Mr. Rogers, the chief error of our time, it is not impossible to detect a good augury, the dawn of brighter days for the Church. For would it not seem that all the strength of the gates of hell has been tried

against her, that heresy has assailed her on every point that might appear vulnerable, and with every kind of weapon, that the enemy is now at last compelled to fall back upon precisely the same mode of attack which he adopted in the first age of her history, and she still rises before us amid opposition ever varying, like a cliff of granite amid clouds and winds?

In the preceding remarks we have been trying to establish the necessity of admitting the influence of authority in philosophical matters, but we have been compelled to confine the argument to a merely negative view of the subject; we have rather been pointing out the incompetence of reason, when depending on its own resources alone, to arrive at a safe conclusion on all those questions concerning the nature of God which are discussed in Metaphysics, than setting forth the positive claims which authority has to direct reason in the solution of them. However, even from the imperfect way in which we have been compelled to deal with the subject, we trust that we have made it sufficiently clear that it is extremely dangerous to faith to overlook or ignore revealed truth in the study of Philosophy.

ART. VIII.—*A Bill to Promote Education in England*, (prepared and brought in by LORD JOHN RUSSELL and MR. HASTINGS.) Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 8 February, 1855.

LITTLE, we fear, is known about the provisions of this Bill. It was ushered into existence at a time when other questions involving the fate of ministries, and therefore more interesting, if not more important, absorbed the public attention. We consequently may perhaps be usefully employed if we convey to our readers some brief explanation of the purport of this proposed measure. It is a peculiar Bill, peculiar in reference to the subject of Education which it proposes to place on a totally new

basis, and peculiar also in reference to the public character of those who introduce it, and, indeed, the consistency of public men in general, as it is diametrically opposed to the last previous propositions, and expressly contradicts the latest professions, of its authors. It is, indeed, the *worst* Bill on the subject of Education which has come under our notice. Of the many which have been ventilated during the last few years, whether proceeding from the Manchester and Salford Laboratory, or recommending itself by the title of the Public (or Secular) School system, whether propounded by Mr. W. J. Fox, or by Sir Harry Inglis, or ushered into brief existence by the government of the day, this, of all the schemes proposed by the various conflicting bodies intent on teaching, appears to us the very worst. It combines whatever in them can be found that is radically wrong in principle, with an organization or system of management which, if ever actually used for such a purpose, would not only damage education for the conduct of which it is unsuited, but would also interfere prejudicially with those other objects for which the organization in question was originally designed, and is both by nature and habit adapted. It admits of secular without religious education, and confides to such authorities as town councils and parish vestries the entire management, direction, and controul of a new set of schools, to be maintained by a public and general Education Rate. The provisions, indeed, of this Bill, on the back of which appears the name of Lord John Russell, are so contrary to everything previously propounded by his Lordship on the subject of Public Education in England, that we are inclined to doubt whether it really be Lord John Russell's Bill at all, and whether his name has not been lent, on the credit of others, to a scheme the real character of which he has yet to learn. We cannot suppose that there has recently occurred, not merely a change, but such a revolution in his Lordship's mind on the subject of education, as would be involved in his real approval of the enactments of this Bill, which is so utterly opposed to the purport of another measure on the same subject, which he introduced into parliament not quite two years ago. On the 4th April, 1853, Lord John Russell rose in the House of Commons to explain generally the intentions of the Government on the important subject of Education, and in so doing began by stating what had been the recent

course of proceeding with respect to the education of the poor in England. He passed in review the systems of Lancaster and Bell, of the British and Foreign School Society, and of the National School Society, and the Government plan for aiding in the education of the poor, through the medium of the Committee of Council on Education. He stated to the House the actual results as to the education of the poor, and it may be useful here to repeat his statistics.

"He had received, only on the previous day, from the Registrar General a statement relative to the number of schools in this country, and of persons receiving education in them. The number of public day schools existing on the 31st of March, 1851, at the taking of the census, was 15,473; the number of persons belonging to the schools, or on the school books, was, males, 791,548, females, 616,021; attending at the schools on the 31st of March, males, 635,107, females, 480,130. The number of private day schools existing on the 31st of March, 1851, was 29,425; the number of persons belonging to the schools, or on the school books, was, males, 347,694, females, 353,210; attending at the schools on the 31st of March, males, 317,390, females, 322,349. The proportion of scholars on the books to the population, was equal to 11.76 per cent, or one scholar to $8\frac{1}{2}$ persons; the proportion of scholars in attendance to scholars on the books was equal to 83 1-5th per cent. The sources of income are as follows:—Local endowments, £69,537, local subscriptions, £366,823, local collections, £114,109, school pence, £413,044, other sources, £83,076, private supporters, £54,000. There was one sum to which he was particularly desirous of calling the attention of the house, the item of £413,044 derived from school pence. He had no doubt the sum here given was below the actual amount, and that we should not err in excess if we were to set down £500,000 as the sum actually contributed in school pence. Now recollecting that half a century ago there were but Sunday Schools for the poor, the result of these efforts was striking, and likewise satisfactory. It induced him to *think that we ought to direct our efforts rather to strengthen and improve the system of education which had grown up chiefly from voluntary efforts, than to attempt to set up anything in its place*, which, while disturbing the existing system, might fail to supply an equal amount of money for the education of the poor."

Thoroughly concurring in this last sentiment of his Lordship, we are surprised to find a completely new and different, and, as we presume to think, very objectionable element introduced in the present Bill, which might, and probably would, have the effect *not* of strengthening and

improving the system of education, which had grown up chiefly from voluntary efforts, but rather of setting up something in its place to disturb the existing system, the precise result deprecated by his Lordship in 1853.

The present Bill authorizes the

"Council of any borough in England to submit to the Education Committee of the Privy Council a scheme for the promotion of education in such borough, whether by establishing and maintaining a new school or schools, or by aiding any existing school or schools with a view to extend the benefits thereof, or by both such means, showing the particulars of the school or schools so proposed to be established or aided respectively, and the rules proposed to be established or adopted for the government or management of such school or schools, including any rules in force which it is proposed to continue in any school to be so aided, with an estimate of the expenditure which will from time to time be required for such school or schools, in addition to any funds which the Council may have at its disposal, or which may be otherwise available for the proposed objects."

Such scheme must have been adopted at a special council meeting, at which not less than two-thirds of the entire number of the council shall have been present.

"In case the Education Committee of the Privy Council approve of such scheme, either with or without any alteration or modification, it shall be lawful for the borough council, by which the same has been submitted, to carry the same into effect."

"Such scheme and such rules may at any time be altered by the borough council with the approval of the said Education Committee, but not otherwise."

To defray the expenditure incurred under this Act, *i.e.*, the costs of their scheme of Education, the Borough Council are authorized to levy a rate not exceeding 6d. in the pound, on all the rateable property in the Borough.

In order to extend the operation of the Bill to parishes not within any borough, one-fifth of the rate-payers of a parish, or at least 50 parishioners, may by requisition call upon the churchwardens to convene a meeting of rate-payers to decide upon the adoption or non-adoption of the act, which meeting the churchwardens are bound to convene, and two-thirds of the votes present at such meeting may decide in favour of the adoption of the act, if they be also a clear majority of the rate-payers of the parish.

When so adopted in any parish, the vestry of such parish may submit to the Educational Committee of the Privy Council a scheme for the promotion of Education in such parish (just, as the town council are previously authorized to do in the case of a borough), and the expenditure incurred under the act in any parish is to be defrayed according to the order of the vestry, by the Overseers out of the poor-rate, but not in any year to exceed sixpence in the pound on the rateable value of the property in the parish.

And the management of the schools both in and out of boroughs, is provided for by the following clause of the Bill, which we copy entire, lest it might be supposed that any inaccuracy had crept into our statement of its purport.

"The Council of any Borough, and the Vestry of any Parish acting under this act, shall have, by themselves, or by such School Committee, or other Committee as they may appoint, *the entire management, direction, and superintendence of the Schools to be established or aided under this act by such Council or Vestry*, subject to the rights of any Trustees or special Visitors of any such Schools; but all Schools established or aided under this act, shall be subject to the inspection of any Inspector appointed by the said Education Committee."

What will be the practical result of all these provisions and authorities, but, either that the act will become altogether nugatory by the schemes of town council or of vestry not obtaining the sanction of the Educational Committee of the Privy Council, or a thoroughly tyrannical and exclusive power will be given to the majority, for the time being, in the town council or the vestry? And, whatever else their result, they will introduce a new element of squabbling and quarrelling (which is quite needless) into the meetings of such municipal and parochial bodies. Within their proper sphere, and confined to their appropriate duties, these bodies are a very useful element of our internal organization, and as such, command our respect. Their disagreements usually arise from an inclination to travel beyond their proper boundaries into national or personal questions, from an ambition to exert a potency like that of Nasmyth's steam hammer, which can crunch a cannon or point a pin, and to determine alike and with the same absolute wisdom the affairs of the nation, and every petty individual right. If it were possible to suppose that this Bill could pass, and that the council of every borough

became thereby authorized to submit to the Privy Council a scheme for the promotion of Education therein, the effect, we feel assured, would be to spoil the Town Council, *as a Town Council*, without making them good managers of education. The education scheme would be an attractive topic; withdrawing the attention of the worthy councillors from less exciting and less popular matters, they would talk very loosely and warmly, and at very great length, and at repeated meetings about it, and at last either party and prejudice would override reason and good sense; or, to take even a more favourable view, their first errors might arise simply from zealous inexperience, and from their having been selected for any other kind of aptitude rather than for that of framing a scheme of education or managing a school. In subsequent years, however, the school question would become the great question upon which would depend the selection by each class of Burghesses of their representatives in the town council. A pledge by any candidate seeking municipal honours, to the popular view (whatever that might be) on Education, would weigh more than all his other qualifications, or disqualifications, put together. No matter how well fitted for all other local business, he would have no chance if not prepared to vote for that style of education which was in fashion at the moment. Municipal matters, properly so speaking, would become of secondary importance, and Education would become the subject of hot contention in every Borough in England. The Church of England men, the Dissenters, the Wesleyans, the Unitarians, the Secularists, the Socialists, (we fear the Catholics would have no chance,) would each labour to disseminate their own views on education through the medium of the town council, and every annual election would be a struggle for school ascendancy. We think it will be agreed that the introduction of such a system as proposed by this bill would effectually accomplish the double purpose of spoiling a good town council, and creating bad school managers.

Similar remarks will, of course, apply to parish vestries, but there usually the absolutism of one party and the exclusion of all others would be more complete.

Without, however, further urging our own ideas, we may quote the personal opinions of Lord John Russell, expressed by him in his place in Parliament, only two years ago, against the purport of the bill upon which his name

now happens to be endorsed. We have already seen how strongly and appropriately and with what good reason he said "that we ought to direct our efforts rather to strengthen and improve the system of education, which had grown up chiefly from voluntary efforts, than to attempt to set up anything in its place," yet the present bill gives the town council and parish vestry the power of attempting to do the very thing which His Lordship here says ought not to be done. These local bodies may seek, and nothing is more natural or more in accordance with the ordinary course of human nature, than for them to seek to establish some new system of education, far better in their judgment than any which they see in operation, of which they alone may enjoy the control and management, and which, sustained by a rate of sixpence in the pound, may soon starve all voluntary free schools in the place out of existence. Nothing is more probable than such a result as this, nothing more questionable than whether this would be any improvement. True, it may be remarked, that the Education Committee of the Privy Council would not be likely to sanction a scheme for establishing new schools to be managed by a town council or parish vestry, in opposition to good free schools, where such already existed in the locality. First of all, though we really have considerable confidence in the good judgment of the Education Committee of the Privy Council, we would rather not entrust to them or to any one the power of sanctioning what may be a positive mischief. But, assuming they will always use such a power discreetly, and will in all such cases refuse their sanction, the act will then become *just nugatory*. And why by the purport of your legislation set town councils and parish vestries to seek after novelties of their own invention (towards which weak human nature is already sufficiently prone), instead of guiding them, as Lord John Russell formerly suggested, towards the strengthening and improving that system of education which had grown up chiefly from voluntary efforts?

Nothing is more trite or common than the remark that, however defective any law or rule may be in theory, yet if it be carried out in practice by good and able hands it works well, whilst a law or rule perfect in theory, if the application of it be confided to unfit or inexperienced hands, may in its results be very far from harmonizing with its design.

Granting, then, if it be possible, for a moment, that a good scheme of education, for children of every variety of religious belief, has been planned and sanctioned, are either a town council or a parish vestry fitted to have "the entire management, direction, and superintendence of such schools," and may not a system originally well designed be tortuously managed, so as to produce great practical mischiefs? What is the check? Inspection by government inspectors. But the Bill gives them no power to apply a prompt remedy, even if they discover occasion for it; they would, we presume, have power only to *recommend* to the School Managers, and to *report* to the Educational Committee of the Privy Council. All persons engaged in the practical administration of any affairs of business, or even of only ordinary experience and observation, know how long evils may continue to exist in the actual conduct of any public department before it be possible to detect and expose a sufficient number of particular instances, how difficult such an exposure is, and how long after the exposure has been accomplished, it will yet be before a complete remedy arrive from head quarters, if ever a complete remedy arrive at all. And what is the remedy, the only one which the Educational Committee of the Privy Council have power to apply? Annihilation—that only. Neither the Inspectors nor the Privy Council have power to stop any particular mischief, to introduce any particular improvement, the latter have only power to put a stop to the schools altogether, they "may at any time make an order, recalling any order, approving any scheme under this act, stating the reasons for such recal; and after such order of recal the provisions of this act respecting the council or vestry, and the schools established or aided by them shall cease and determine," so that, although the privy council should see certain defects in any schools, or think them susceptible of certain improvements, yet they have no power to amend them, and cannot even consistently exercise the only power conferred upon them, if they deem the existing schools, however defective, to be better than none at all. And all this awkward local machinery and ineffective central control, to set up something new in lieu of a system which Lord John Russell praises, as we have seen, for the results it has already accomplished!

His Lordship in 1853, stated that, "neither he nor the

present government could be a party to any plan for proposing a secular mode of teaching instead of that which was at present established." Yet the present Bill enables a town council or a parish vestry to propose "a secular mode of teaching," the only religious requirement in the act being, "that the Holy Scriptures shall be read in the school as part of the reading therein, but not so as to be used as a school lesson-book."

"He did not think it possible to unite throughout the country the children of persons of different religious communions in one plan of education." Yet, this Bill, endorsed by his Lordship, now authorizes the establishment of such a plan, and it expressly contemplates the collection of children of different religions in one school, since it provides that "no child of any parents professing the Roman Catholic or the Jewish religion, shall be obliged to be present at the reading of the Holy Scriptures, unless such parents, or the guardians of such child, are willing that such child should be so present." Is it possible that the same person who uttered the sentiments we have quoted from him only two years ago, could now, with full knowledge of its contents, have introduced the present Bill? The presumption is almost irresistible that his Lordship is not really aware of its purport. In certain respects the present plan agrees with that propounded by him on the former occasion, in employing the agency of town councils to express public opinion in boroughs, as to the expediency of an education rate, in requiring a majority of two-thirds of the council, and in some other details sufficient to show that the one is borrowed from or grafted upon the other, but the variances are not merely variances, but contradictions, and contradictions in essential matters. What, for example, can be more essentially important than the kind of schools which in corporate towns are to be supported by an education rate; yet the present Bill authorizes the establishment of schools quite different from those which alone were thought deserving of aid on the former occasion. Lord John Russel *then* said:

"In towns of this kind, (which had a corporate organization,) there was not any necessity for establishing schools of one kind. There were in those towns, generally, schools belonging to various communions, all of which received, or might receive, some support

by the ministers of the Committee of the Privy Council. It appeared to them, therefore, that it was possible, at all events, to give power to the commissioners and municipal councils of such towns, and vote a rate for the purpose of improving education therein. But in so doing they should think it necessary to impose certain conditions, in order to prevent evil which might otherwise arise. They thought it necessary that the rate should be applied, not to establish schools in substitution of former schools, but in aid of the voluntary efforts of individuals, and of the school pence given by the parents of the children."

A very excellent arrangement, and one which appears so sound and prudent that it is almost impossible to suppose his Lordship could be aware that the present Bill admits of the very evil which he was then desirous of guarding against, and that it authorizes a Town Council to submit a scheme for the promotion of Education in their borough, by establishing and maintaining a new school or schools, which may, of course, either by original design be, or by subsequent management in practice, become substituted for those former schools there supported by the voluntary efforts of individuals.

Again, upon a vitally important principle, that of religious instruction, Lord John Russell, two years ago, said:

"The resolution to which the association (i.e. the Manchester and Salford School Association,) had come, made it an absolute and essential condition that the Scriptures should be read in the authorized version, leaving, however, the Roman Catholics to use the Douay version. But it was to be expected, and it did occur, that the Roman Catholics demurred altogether to the religious instruction to be given in such schools, and they, therefore, formed a minority dissenting from that plan. Now, he (Lord John Russell) thought the same difficulty would be found in any attempts to frame any other plan, and they should not, therefore, propose that the power of the town councils should go further than the appointment of a committee, which should distribute the sums obtained from the rate according to the ministers of the Committee of Privy Council."

His Lordship then thought the objections of the Roman Catholics to the religious teaching under the Manchester and Salford system so far reasonable that he framed his own plan to avoid them, whilst now he makes his own plan still more objectionable than the Manchester and Salford system. He, or at least his Bill, (for we will not

impute it to him personally) now makes it, as the Manchester and Salford system then did, an absolute and essential condition, that the Scriptures should be read *in the authorized version*, in every school aided under the Bill, (except distinct Catholic or Jewish schools, if any such could be likely to come into existence under the Bill,) but it does *not* leave the Catholics at liberty to use the Douay version, it merely permits them on such occasions to walk out of the schools, a kind of procedure not very likely to promote their comfortable association with their fellows. Why are Catholics to be subjected to this indignity because they cannot consider the authorized but inaccurate version of Holy Scriptures to be really the Word of God? Are Protestants treated in a corresponding manner in Ireland? Is the Douay or Catholic version there directed to be used in all the joint schools, with permission to the Protestant children to be absent? Yet Protestants are the minority in Ireland, as Catholics are the minority in England. All we claim is, that *the same measure of justice be meted out to the Catholic minority in England, which is accorded to the Protestant minority in Ireland.*

But the difficulties to which we have just alluded, as involved in the provisions of the present Bill, were avoided in the plan more carefully propounded by His Lordship in 1853. He did not then propose to authorize town councils, to establish and manage new schools in which all the varieties of religion should be aggregated together, the considerations which we have already quoted in His Lordship's words, led him rather to propose that the power of the town councils should go no further than the appointment of a committee which should distribute the sums obtained from the rate according to the minutes of the Committee of the Privy Council. The Education Rate would, according to this more prudent scheme, have been applied in aid of the existing schools established and maintained mainly by the voluntary efforts of the more sincere and zealous members of each religious body, and placed under government inspection, where, therefore, the peculiar founders of each school cared most appropriately and effectually as to its course of religious instruction, whilst the State, by inspection, promoted and became assured respecting the general secular education. This was a fair and impartial system, from which the present

Bill has unfortunately, and, we still trust, unknown to its nominal introducer, departed.

The town council, moreover, was to have no control over the schools, and no concern in the actual management of them, a provision which any one practically acquainted with the composition of town councils, would deem one of ordinary prudence; the present Bill vests in the town council, "the entire management, direction, and superintendence of the schools to be established *or aided* by them," so that not only would the new schools, to be originally established by town councils, be under their management, but if the town council were, in their wisdom, minded to extend aid out of the Education rate to any existing schools, no such existing schools, whether Church of England, Wesleyan, Dissenting, Catholic, or of any other kind, could receive one farthing of such aid from the education rate without thereby divesting their own founders, trustees, and managers, of all right of further control over them, and at once vesting their entire management, direction, and superintendence in the town council. Surely Lord John Russell could not have had any such intention; surely no sane man could have drawn such a Bill!

But though the duties of the town council were confined to the apportionment of the Educational Rate amongst the existing schools under government inspection, yet careful provision was made, as Lord John Russell in his former speech tells us, that "the committee to be appointed by the town council" (for even that limited object) "would be formed partly of members of the council, and partly of other persons resident in the town, who would be able to obtain accurate information with respect to the schools, and see that all the conditions required by the State, were complied with in those schools." Yet now the members of the town council alone, without any aid from other persons resident in the town (and possibly more conversant with schools) are to administer the still larger, nay, the arbitrary and exclusive powers to be so lavishly confided to them by this Bill. The framers of this Bill must have lost all forethought and discretion, and have been indeed under the influence of some peculiar hallucination.

But though we cannot speak in terms of commendation of the present Bill, we must admit that the proposal of Lord John Russell in 1853, seemed to meet the peculiar

difficulties of the education question in this country in a very reasonable manner. That suggestion in effect was, as will have appeared from our previous quotations, that neither the state nor town councils should originate any new system of education, and that, far from interfering with the voluntary educational efforts at present making by different religious bodies, it should only guide and improve their secular branch of instruction by inspection, and assist them by pecuniary allowance, *according to the actual number of children attending each such school*. A government inspector devoted to the business of examining and reporting upon the state and condition of a great number of schools of every possible character, and frequently visiting them, might have a wholesome effect in quickening the energies of schoolmasters, keeping them up to the highest point of exertion, and enabling them to profit by the experience and suggestions which the inspector had collected throughout his whole tour of investigation. An inspector, in fact, might be a material aid to any school committee in ascertaining that the schoolmaster did his duty, whilst *they* would probably be vigilant enough to take care that the inspector did not exceed his duty.

We cordially agree with Lord John Russell that the state should not support any mere secular system of education, even on the recommendation of a town council. It cannot originate in this country a uniform religious system of its own, and the only remaining mode, therefore, is that which Lord John Russell recommended two years ago, and which, although deviated from by the present Bill, we trust he will on consideration again adopt, of assisting voluntary religious efforts in the cause of education, provided only they give the guarantee of character and efficiency in secular instruction, by submitting the latter to government inspection.

Of the plan of the Public School Association, of that recommended by Mr. W. J. Fox, M.P., and of any other plan of merely secular education, excluding religious instruction, we would only say that their principles may be very sound and suitable for training a horse, a dog, or any other animal, the existence of which terminates with its life, but they are not appropriate to a human being who is placed here for the sole object of determining by his own conduct in this world what shall be his position in another.

The advocates of a national system of secular education do not however usually deny the value of religious instruction, they only say that it cannot, in any general system, be incorporated with secular teaching, without unfairness to some body or other, and therefore they would exclude it from a national system of education, and leave vacant opportunities for its being separately supplied either by parents, who too often want it themselves, by clergy who have often other heavy duties disabling them from attending to this, or by any one who may volunteer to fill up parenthetically this really essential part of a child's education. This is not the mode in which these advocates of secular education deal with their own sons and daughters. Whatever may be the religious persuasion to which they belong, they are usually careful to send their own children to a school where they will be instructed in the religious truths which they themselves conscientiously maintain. All we ask these gentlemen is, that any education for the poor to be provided or aided from the public purse, should as closely as possible resemble that which, as a general rule, they set all parents the example of choosing for their own children.

But how can this be compatible with the freedom of the very numerous varieties of religious belief which prevail in this country? The Education Committee of the Privy Council have already aimed at accomplishing this by aiding to some extent the zealous efforts of those who undertake the duty of establishing free schools for the education of the poor. If it be expedient still further to assist these efforts by local education rates, then Lord John Russell's scheme, as proposed by him two years ago, is one which we should rather attempt to improve than to oppose. He said:—

“They should propose some such scheme as this—that the rate might be applied to pay two-pence in the week for the scholars, provided four pence or five pence were contributed from other sources. The schools which received this assistance, should be schools which, under the minutes of the privy council, might receive assistance, and which, consequently, had for years received the sanction of parliament.”

The introduction of this rate in every borough he made dependent upon the vote of a majority, consisting of not less than two-thirds of the town council. And he men-

tioned that the Education Committee of the Privy Council, had proposed also by a minute, which had been for some time under consideration, to allow in certain instances to places which had not municipal corporations, a certain sum per head for each child attending the school.

"The Committee of the Privy Council had likewise resolved upon the propriety of making additional grants for buildings in some poor places where great difficulty existed in obtaining a sum for establishing schools."

We were glad to observe this last resolution, because, if so much consideration be due to *poor places*, it must be equally due to *poor persons* wherever resident, if they be so circumstanced as to be unable to get schools erected for them, if e.g. they be poor persons of one faith surrounded by persons of another faith, or of no faith at all. The defect, indeed, of the present system of distributing the parliamentary education grant is, that it proceeds upon the principle of allowing much to have more. Grants are made only in a certain proportion to local subscriptions, and, following out the same idea, His Lordship proposed to confine the aid from the education rate to two pence a week from each scholar, "provided four pence or five pence be contributed from other sources." The consequence is, that under the distribution by the Education Committee of the Privy Council, as it still would be under Lord John Russell's proposal, the rich bodies least in need of aid obtain the largest share of pecuniary aid, whilst those who are poor and have probably plenty of poor children needing instruction which they cannot give them, are denied their numerical proportion of national aid just because they are in extreme want of it. The privy council have, Lord John Russell informs us, seen the propriety of deviating from such a rule under certain circumstances, and we trust they will give still further attention to the urgent claims of poverty and numbers.

We trust also for the same reason that, if an education rate be sanctioned at all, it will be justly distributed, according rather to the wants and necessities of the poor, than as a sequence to the private liberality of the rich, and that the unfortunate circumstance of any number of poor children being unfriended or without adequate private aid

shall not be a reason for also withholding from them the public assistance.

To any interference in the management of schools, either by a central government, or by any local body, we strongly object; they will most effectually and usefully accomplish their purpose without any such interference. A periodical visitation by a government inspector, whose experience and practical observation of a variety of schools makes him well aware what is best and most appropriate for each, and enables him to point out errors and suggest improvements, may be a valuable auxiliary to most establishments for the education of the poor, and the moral effect of his recommendations to the teachers and managers of each school, and of his published reports to government, might not only tend to keep any school from getting far wrong, but enable each to borrow what was best from the others, and keep them all in a steady course of improvement.

Why should not every school so inspected, (being also a free school,) have a legal claim to the extent of, say five-pence, for every boy, and four-pence for every girl, *actually attending* such school? The local body, through the medium of which the Education Rate would be collected, should, we conceive, have no other interference with the affairs of any school than to ascertain, 1st., That the school is under government inspection and a free school; 2nd. What are the number of boys and girls actually attending such school each week? and, 3rd. To pay out of the rate to the managers of each school the fixed amount due to them, according to the above scale of payment.

Provisions would, of course, be requisite to secure a proper record of the weekly attendance of scholars at each school, and the Education Rate might be limited in each year to a certain sum per pound of rateable value, which might, of course, involve a proportionate reduction of the weekly pay for each scholar, if the limited rate did not supply funds for the full scale of allowance.

The error, alike of the Manchester and Salford scheme, and of Lord John Russell's *present* Bill, appears to us to be this, in supposing it requisite that the local body, by whom the Education Rate is collected, should, under any circumstances, have anything to do with the practical management of education. We prefer the contrary opinion

expressed by Lord John Russell two years ago, and conceive that the rate-collecting body ought to stand in much the same position, with respect to the education of the poor, as the overseers now do, with respect to the relief of the poor; the overseers forming merely the machinery by which all are compelled to discharge, to a certain extent, the duty of relieving the poor, but the funds thus collected by them being handed over to, and the relief actually administered by the guardians. In a corresponding position to that of the overseers, ought, in our opinion, to be placed the local organization for collecting the Education Rate. They would form, in fact, a national machinery to prevent any one escaping from the duty of contributing his quota towards the education of the poor. But the funds thus levied by them they would distribute to those who are now acting as the zealous and conscientious guardians of education throughout the country, according to the very best test of need in each instance, the actual number of scholars. The only practical effect of an Education Rate would thus be to extract something for the purposes of education from the pockets of those *who would not voluntarily have contributed to it*; and all classes and denominations would thus secure the pecuniary means of education according to the actual numbers requiring it. The freedom of education would remain complete, while the free efforts of the willing spirits at present devoted to so good a cause, would receive pecuniary aid according to the actual success of their exertions, with the advantage of collateral aid and advice from the government inspector. Each one would be left at liberty, as now, to avail himself of that form of education which he preferred, the only difference would be, that the burden of the pecuniary cost of educating the poor would not rest, as now, exclusively on the shoulders of the willing few, but would be rateably borne by all according to their rateable means.

With regard to parishes and other places beyond municipal boundaries, we infer that, if it were not fitting to entrust the management of education in boroughs to town councils, neither could it be suited to entrust that delicate duty to parish vestries in parishes; indeed, any arrangement of the kind would be entirely needless, if such a legal allowance as we have mentioned, were directed to be made for the scholars actually attending all inspected free schools; voluntary zeal might then

safely be left to establish and manage them wherever wanted; and worse than needless, because it would involve all the difficulties and mischiefs inherent in a composite board of management. Independent of all other objections, no state machinery, or parochial machinery, could ever manage any schools as well as the voluntary efforts of men conscientiously devoted to the cause of religious education. With these voluntary efforts government should not encourage any local authorities officiously to intermeddle, but rather aid and support them in the manner suggested. The state or the parish would be a very indifferent schoolmaster, though well enough adapted to be an effective Tax Collector.

Since the foregoing remarks were penned, we have perused the debate on Sir John Pakington's motion for leave to bring in a Bill for the better encouragement of Education in England and Wales, and its tendency is very strongly to confirm all our previous impressions.

Sir John Pakington proposes, if we understand him rightly, not merely to leave existing schools undisturbed, but to aid them out of the Education Rate, subject to the condition of their being under government inspection; and the only variance as to these schools, between the present plan of Sir John Pakington and that of Lord John Russell, *two years ago*, would seem to be, that whilst the Tory baronet would make the schools perfectly *free*, and support them wholly from the public rate, the Whig lord would give a small part of what was requisite for their support out of the public purse, provided the remainder were forthcoming from private and other sources. Our readers will have gathered from our previous remarks that, as between the two, we should incline to think Sir John Pakington's the preferable proposal.

But the rock upon which they both split, and upon which the Manchester and Salford system also splits, is, in seeking to authorize any local public body whatever to intermeddle in the *management* of schools, and, when they think there are not schools enough in a locality, to erect and conduct new schools according to some plan of their own. This would be both a needless and a mischievous interference. Surrounded with difficulties and liable to mischief all admit that such an interference would be: the onus therefore of proving its need lies with

those who propose it. Sir John Pakington seems to imagine that, if he only prove that the existing schools do not adequately educate all the poor children of the country, it therefore follows, as a necessary consequence, that new schools should be established and managed *by some public body or other*. Yet is this a necessary consequence at all? There is a *tertium quid* far better calculated to accomplish the object of education and to avoid all its acknowledged difficulties. *Give ample aid to the zealous committees of existing schools*, so as to enable these friends and managers of education to respond alike to the public wants and to their own wishes. Is it not obvious that the men who are now, to the utmost of their limited means, caring for and fostering education, will do this work better than any public board? And can it be doubted that, if adequate pay out of an Education Rate be made the right of every child attending a school under government inspection, such schools will, through the spontaneous zeal of these men, rise up wherever they are wanted, especially if, in very poor districts, some little special contribution be accorded by the Education Committee of the Privy Council towards the erection of schools? If at Manchester, Sheffield, Newcastle on Tyne, and the other places mentioned by Sir John Pakington, the earnest members of each religious community knew that they could demand four-pence or five-pence a week for every scholar actually attending a school established by them under government inspection, would they not soon provide school-rooms and teachers for all the poor children of their respective bodies? Are not schools thus originating and thus managed, if only thus supported, far better than any composite schools under the composite management of any local board? and are they not free from all the difficulties and religious divisions which would embarrass the others? What need, then, of a new and hazardous experiment to do that which can be more safely and more effectually done by the expansion of a system of which we have had experience and recognize the merits, which in spite of scant means has already done much, and which, with larger means, may do more, indeed, everything possible?

But Sir John Pakington says in effect, "you can no more carry on education by means of voluntary management than you can carry on war by means of voluntary

management;" the objection sounds rather antithetically plausible, but it seems to us that the system we suggest of enlarging, strengthening, and extending existing schools, and giving full pecuniary aid to all who may apply themselves to the conduct of education under government inspection very much resembles our British mode of warfare, wherein the military pay is raised by government taxes, whilst the soldiers entitle themselves to receive it by voluntary enlistment.

It is obvious also that Sir John Pakington's experiment of *free* schools can be just as well tried under an extension of the existing schools as by means of any new schools or any new organization.

There is one sophistical illustration in Sir John Pakington's speech which it may be well to expose. He says, that because the Poor Law Guardians give relief to the poor of all religions, equally can a local board impart education to all. The very statement of the sophism is its exposure. Every employer of labour might with equal truth say that he can as easily direct the education of all the children of his workmen as pay the latter their wages.

Religion has nothing to do with ordinary parochial relief, but Sir John Pakington expressly says in one part of his speech :

"If there are honourable gentlemen in this house who contend that religion has nothing to do with education, and that we should teach no religion to children, I can only say that with them I have nothing in common."

And in another part—

"I am a Churchman myself, and will not forego the catechism."

We honour him for the sentiment; let him only concede to others what he claims for himself. He would deal with the religious difficulty by letting the majority in each place decide what shall be the general rule as to religious instruction, with leave of absence to the exceptional irregulars. *If Sir John Pakington will tell us why this system was not adopted in Ireland, we will tell him why we think it ought not to be adopted in England.* As it was not thought fair or favourable enough for the minority in Ireland, let the English minority have the benefit of the same consideration.

We beg, finally, to say that *we* have not proposed an education rate, but *if* it be adopted, we are sure, and we think careful reflection will lead most others to the conclusion, that, in the circumstances of this country, local public bodies cannot properly be entrusted with the *management* of Education; that their only appropriate duty would be to *collect* the rate, and pay over to the managers of each School under Government inspection, the sum due in respect of the actual number of scholars in weekly attendance at such school, and that, if private zeal were thus aided by public money, schools would soon spontaneously arise under the most effective management to meet the educational wants of the people. In these schools government and the public would deal with the religious difficulty in by far the most appropriate manner, viz., by *letting it alone*, and leaving each religious body to deal with it and with education together as they ought to be dealt with together, according to their own earnest convictions.

ART. IX.—1. *The History of the Early Puritans*; from the Reformation to the Opening of the Civil War, in 1642. By J. B. MARSDEN, M.A. Second Edition. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co. 1853.

2. *The History of Later Puritans*; from the Opening of the Civil War, in 1642, to the Ejection of the non-conforming Clergy in 1662. By J. B. MARSDEN, M.A. Second Edition. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co. 1854.

3. *Origin and Development of Anglicanism*; or a History of the Liturgies, Homilies, Articles, Bibles, Principles, and Governmental System of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. WATERWORTH, S.J. London: Burns and Lambert. 1854.

4. *A History of the Articles of Religion*. By CHARLES HARDWICKE, M.A. 8vo. Cambridge: Deighton. 1851.

5. *A History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices.* By the REV. FRANCIS PROCTER, M.A., 8vo. Cambridge: McMillan and Co. 1855.

WE are beginning to outgrow the memory of the once celebrated illustration by which Dr. Hook made it plain that the Anglican Church, before the Reformation, remains precisely identical with the Anglican Church of the present day, "as a man who has washed his face in the morning remains the same man as he was before he had washed." * For a long series of years, in the popular Anglican theory of the modern history of the National Church, the attitude which she has maintained from the sixteenth century downwards, was explained as purely or principally a self-reformation. It was held to have been purely her own act. She herself took the initiative. She herself laid down the great principles by which the reforms were to be guided; she herself followed up the leading details in the work. If a Catholic historian or controversialist ventured to suggest that the moving power was the State and not the Church, he was met by an indignant denial. The State, it was admitted, had assisted in the carrying out of the plan. But it was the Church herself who conceived and matured it. She but accepted the assistance and support which were offered in her struggle. The State was but the "nursing mother" of the second infancy through which the Church had to pass in her progress towards a new and more perfect organisation.

Still, even while Dr. Hook's very primitive illustration was still in all the freshness of its novelty, there were found persons hard headed enough to question its appropriateness; and some of our readers may yet recollect, in an early number of this Journal,† a very brilliant and masterly dissertation, one of the last great efforts of the illustrious Catholic historian of England, by which the silliness and absurdity of the pretension was unsparingly laid bare. It is an old theory of ours, that there are very few of the positions assumed by the antagonists of the Catholic

* A Sermon, preached at the Chapel Royal, in St. James's Palace, on the first Sunday after Trinity, June 17, 1838. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., p. 7.

† Vol. viii. pp. 334 and following.

Church, which may not be turned against each other, with far more effect than they carry against the common adversary whom they all seek to assail. A skilful use of the weapons employed against each other by various sects of Protestantism, in their internecine warfare, would supply one of the most curious, and we will venture to say, one of the most solid and convincing, arguments of the truth of the Catholic Religion to be found in the whole range of polemical literature. And it is a very remarkable confirmation of the line of argument adopted by Dr. Lingard in the memorable article to which we refer, that the main theory by which Mr. Marsden, in his history of the Puritans, accounts for the character impressed upon the English Reformation, and for the contrasts which its system presents to that of the Reformation as developed in any of the churches of the Continent, is, that in the latter the movement was a spontaneous one, in the former it was but the result of an impulse from the power above. "The Reformation in England," says he "*originated with the monarch and was transmitted to the people through the regular forms of the constitution.* Upon the continent and in Scotland the order was reversed. With the exception of a few of the minor German states, in which the reigning princes led the movement they were unable to control, the reformation was *begun by the people*, and carried into effect *against the will of the higher civil authorities*, or without their assistance. The character of this vast revolution, both at home and abroad, *partook of the circumstances of its origin*, and in each case still retains the visible impression of its peculiar parentage. In England, the reformed religion immediately assumed the outward symbols of a monarchical institution and the church, represented by its higher clergy, again, as before the Reformation, took its place in the constitution, without exciting jealousy in the crown, or stimulating those passions which the possession of a new and formidable power invariably creates amongst the people. The spirit of the institution was naturally tinged by the same circumstances. It was a matter of course, in a reformation of which a succession of sovereigns were the first promoters, that episcopacy should be retained, and not less so that a certain degree of magnificence and splendour should invest the national church, and display itself both in the dignities of its hierarchy and in the ceremonial of its public worship: and

thus the church of England assumed, and has ever since retained, a more exact gradation of spiritual dignities, and a more stately mode of worship, than the reformed churches of other lands. Upon the continent the higher clergy, following the general example of the civil powers, stood aloof, or met the reformation with fierce hostility. Scarcely a churchman of rank joined with it. Princes and prelates viewed it at first with equal scorn, and afterwards, as they learned something of the vast and awful power it wielded, with equal hatred. Thus, the reformation in Germany, France and Switzerland was a popular, and sometimes a plebeian, movement. To a certain extent the case was similar in Scotland; except that the barons and chief estates of the kingdom being already arrayed against the sovereign, the management of the reformation fell into their hands: and the struggle between the new and the old opinions became political, and was embittered with another element of civil strife. Thus the reformation in the foreign churches, originating among the common people and the inferior clergy, took a democratic form. They became presbyterian in their government, and simple even to excess in their modes of worship. For the one they pleaded necessity; for the other the sanction of primitive antiquity, and the tenor of the new testament. None of them at first rejected episcopacy as unlawful. Calvin and others have recorded their concurrent sense of its importance; though in effect they considered themselves at liberty, under the circumstances in which they were placed, to reconstruct the reformed churches upon another model. For the simplicity of their forms of worship they made no apology; differing in this, though without personal animosities or any feeling of unkindliness, from the great reformers of the church of England."

Nor has any of the Tractarian writers, notwithstanding the learning and zeal which they have devoted to the enquiry, succeeded even yet in disturbing the received theory of the last generation, that whatever of life or energy there was in the religious revolution of England, was the same in spirit, in principle, in origin, and in tendency, with the kindred movement abroad, and especially in that foreign Church with which alone anything like active intercourse or cordial sympathy can be discovered—the Church of Geneva. During the reign of Henry, no one will pretend that the Church in England had a voice,

or even a living existence. Under Edward, the churchmen who acted, acted but as the exponents of the higher powers who were all partizans of the foreign Reformation; and in the final organization of the Church system under Elizabeth, the only part taken therein by the Church itself, was to act as a drag upon the onward progress of innovation. High Church theories may interest us by their earnest scholarship, or please our fancy by their poetical associations; but no one can read, without prepossession, the history of any single passage in the whole career of the English Reformation, and, so reading, resist the earnest, though reluctant conviction, that had the movement been left free, had it directed itself according to its own impulses, the result would have been, (perhaps after many pauses and oscillations, but yet inevitably,) some modification or another of that spiritual system, which, in the various forms in which it has manifested itself at different times and in different circumstances, is known under the general name of PURITANISM.

The very origin, indeed, of the party in England, would in itself, lead us to that conclusion. On the check which the reforming movement, begun with so much vigour under Edward, received at the accession of Mary, the most ardent of the reformers of the previous reign and those who were most deeply compromised, sought safety either in concealment at home or in a retirement into the more congenial shelter of the foreign Churches of opinions kindred with their own. Their return to England on the accession of Elizabeth, found them not alone with their natural ardour unsubdued by adversity, but, even on this very account, with all their former views exaggerated by a large infusion of the more sweeping and revolutionary spirit which distinguished the democratic communions of Switzerland, which had been the chief scene of their exile. Now, these are the men to whom the Puritan element of the English Reformation is due. These are the Puritan Fathers. And the very violence and exaggeration of their views engendered an earnestness which has left its trace upon all that they did or attempted, and which contrasts very markedly with the timid, vacillating, "open question" system, which forms the great characteristic of the theology of the state party in the Church under Elizabeth.

We have been much disappointed in our hope of finding Mr. Marsden's "*History of the Puritans*," a solution of

these and many other interesting questions connected with the church affairs of that period ; nor can we say that it will add much to our knowledge of this remarkable party. In the effort to be popular, the author has become vague, sketchy, and superficial. Of the theology of the Puritans his work cannot be said to contain any history at all ; and even their political fortunes, as a party, are not traced with that distinctness and precision which should constitute the chief merit of a book specially devoted to themselves. Above all, in what would form the most attractive and curious department of their history—the Biography of the Puritans—Mr. Marsden is singularly deficient. His sketches of the great heroes of the party are extremely few and meagre, and they are entirely destitute of that graphic force and dramatic interest, which, in what are called popular histories, form the best compensation for the want of depth and comprehensiveness of detail, by which unfortunately they are so commonly accompanied.

Like all who have gone before him as historians of puritanism, he professes his inability to offer any satisfactory account of the origin of the name itself. It occurs very soon after the accession of Elizabeth, but it does not appear to have been much used for ten years afterwards. Mr. Marsden urges it as a testimony to the moral character of those by whom it was first borne ; and argues that “it seems to imply that if their professions were high, their lives, at least, were consistent, and their morals pure.” But the argument is entirely without foundation. It is plain that the name was not one of their own choosing. He admits that it was applied to them in scorn, that it was borne with impatience, and often resented as a grievous wrong ; nor can it be doubted that both in its import, and with motives of its application, it is a literal transcript of the old appellative *Cathari*, a title borne, if not assumed, by every sect of rigoristic pretensions, from the Montanists to the Insabbatati and the Waldensians.

It is well worthy of observation that, in common with all their other historians, Mr. Marsden represents the Puritans throughout the first phase of their history, as undoubted members of the Church of England, and declares, that “though anxious for improvement, and sometimes fretful for change, they revered the great principle of an established church, and did not entertain a thought of separating from her communion.” And to those

who in later times, and especially during the great movement of the last twenty years, have so strongly insisted upon the separation of the two elements in the church, and have so earnestly elung to the fond belief that their own (or what they call the Catholic) system, was the primitive system of the reformed English Church of the sixteenth century, it should furnish grave matter for reflection, that, even under the iron rule of Elizabeth, at the very time when the constitution of their Church was being finally determined, and when, after full discussion of all the controversies, both domestic and foreign, which had arisen, the code of Articles of Religion was definitively settled, it was fully understood, both on the side of the Puritans, and on that of the men who sought to maintain a higher tone, that free provision was made, and full room was given, for the comprising, within its ample terms, *both the extremes towards which they severally tended*. In truth, neither the decision of the privy council in the Gorham case, nor the evident shrinking from a decision in the cases of Archdeacon Wilberforce and Archdeacon Denison, can be regarded as a plainer evidence of that "compromise," which is the very essence of Anglicanism, than the position accorded to the Puritans, and occupied by them, during the forty years of the reign of Elizabeth.

We cannot help being struck in Mr. Marsden's history, by the absence of all notice of the earlier members of the party, and particularly of those among them who distinguished themselves by their writings during the reign of Mary. It was not unnatural, indeed, that Mr. Marsden should desire to close his eyes to those darker fruits of the Reformation in England, which Strype, writing in the year 1556, very feelingly describes. It is not wonderful that he should be willing to pass by "the abundance of sects, and dangerous doctrines, whose maintainers shrouded themselves under the professors of the Gospel;" some of whom "denied the Godhead of Christ, and some impugned His manhood;" some, again, denied the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, or original sin, or free will, or infant baptism, and who were so numerous and so widely-spread, that, by Strype's own account the divinity professor of Oxford, Traheron, thought it necessary, in order to meet the evil, to direct his lectures not against the Papists, who were comparatively unobnoxious, but "against the Arians, who began much to increase in their times." Sectaries like these

do not, it is true, fairly come within a plan such as Mr. Marsden's. But we cannot help wondering that he did not give us any account of Joye, or Delaber, or Goodman, or Ponet, or John Bale, or of that Traheron, the divinity professor, to whom we have just alluded. These are, beyond all question, the earliest founders and most rightful representatives of the Puritan system, and as such should not have been passed over in a work which professes to detail the history of the party. Possibly Mr. Marsden may not have been unwilling to escape this painful chapter on Puritan history. To have alluded to it at all would have entailed some revelations which it was perhaps more pleasant to avoid. No serious historian dealing professedly with that period, could have avoided going over once again the ground which was so fearlessly broken by Dr. Maitland, in his "Essays on the English Reformation;" and the pictures of "Puritan Veracity," "Puritan Loyalty," and "Puritan Charity," which Dr. Maitland's too candid pencil has drawn, would have formed but a sorry frontispiece for a history so thoroughly eulogistic as Mr. Marsden's was designed to be.

The first event in the history of Puritanism, on which Mr. Marsden dwells, is the celebrated Vestiarian Controversy; and he observes, as a very remarkable circumstance, that for many years after the first development of their principles, and their first organization as a party, this was the only controversy in which they engaged with the Established Church. We can hardly understand in what sense Mr. Marsden ventures upon this assertion. It is true, indeed, that Bishop Carleton, in his Examination of Montague's Appeal, contends that while the Puritans urged for the adoption of their own favourite discipline, "they never moved any quarrel against the doctrine of the Church." But this statement is entirely irreconcilable with many unquestioned facts. The Act of 1571, was so ambiguously worded as to exempt the puritanic clergy from subscribing the articles on ecclesiastical traditions; and, under cover of this non-subscription, they claimed most complete liberty of doctrine.* The two well-known Puritan manifestoes,—the "Admonitions to Parliament" in 1572, vehemently assail the Prayer-book

* See Hardwicke's *History of the Articles*, p. 201.

and the Ordinal, while they grant but a qualified and reluctant toleration to the Articles themselves. If they consent to receive the last-named formulary, it is only on the understanding, that they use "a godly interpretation in a poynte or two, which are either too sparely or else too darkly set downe;" while, with reference to the Prayer-book and Ordinal, they openly declare the one to be full of corruptions, and the other to contain a paragraph which is "manifest blasphemy." A few years later, we find an organized agitation against the article on the Holy Scripture; against the sixteenth article as implying the doctrine of defectibility from grace; and, indeed, against the whole body of the articles "as the fruit of prelatical or popish domination." Nor can it, we think, be reasonably doubted, that such opinions regarding the articles prevail to a greater or less degree among the religious malecontents throughout the entire reign of Elizabeth.*

It may be that Mr. Marsden, when he asserts that no doctrinal division had taken place between the Puritans and the Church, relies upon the fact that these and similar objections to the articles and similar demands for their modification or explanation existed among the churchmen themselves, and therefore may be regarded as at least tolerated within her pale. Understood in this sense, his statement is certainly true. In the well-known controversies which disturbed the universities, and especially that of Cambridge, during the last ten years of the sixteenth century, the warmest advocates of the Calvinistic doctrines were not merely by subscription of the articles members of the Anglican church, but were among the most zealous defenders of the Prayer-book and Ritual. The party at Cambridge, which compelled the retirement of the Arminian Margaret Professor, Baron, and the retractation of the University Preacher, William Barrett, would have repudiated the alliance with Puritanism almost as indignantly as the tractarians of our own day. Whitaker, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, who was the leader of the movement, cordially accepted the Prayer-book, professed himself a devout adherent of Episcopacy, and was not only regarded as an unexceptionable churchman, but, from the learning and ability which he had

* Ibid. p. 202-4.

displayed in his controversy with Bellarmine, was universally looked up to as one of the great champions of Anglican orthodoxy. Equally unquestioned by the Anglicans of this period was the orthodoxy and churchmanship of his friend and colleague Perkins; yet Perkins's views upon election and reprobation, and other dogmas of Calvinism, would entitle him to a place in the most rigorous school of Puritan theology.

But in whatever sense we understand this memorable fact of the long peace between the Church and the early Puritans, it can only be regarded as another historical evidence of the compromise on which the very constitution of the Church was based, and to which alone she owed the semblance of union which she contrived to maintain under Elizabeth. Mr. Marsden distinctly maintains that during the forty years of peace, there was no recognized difference of doctrine between the Anglican church and those of continental Protestantism.

"It would not be difficult to show that all the foreign churches taught, with scarcely a perceptible shade of difference, the doctrines of our own. The presbyterian church of Scotland expresses herself in language entirely consonant with that of the English church, whether in our office for baptism, our articles, or our catechism; and in language of equal strength. 'We assuredly believe that by baptism we are engrafted into Christ Jesus, to be made partakers of his justice, by which our sins are covered and remitted: and that also in the supper, rightly used, Christ Jesus is so joined with us that he becometh the very nourishment and food of our souls. But all this, we say, cometh of true faith, which apprehendeth Christ Jesus, who only maketh his sacraments effectual unto us.' Thus she speaks in her confession, which was first exhibited to, and allowed by, the three estates in parliament, at Edinburgh, in the year 1560; again ratified at the same place, and on the same authority, in 1567; and finally subscribed by the king and his household, at Holyrood house, in 1581. Seventy years afterwards, when the presbyterian divines assembled at Westminster to remodel the church of England, and to carry out the most fervent aspirations of Cartwright in his younger days, the doctrine of the sacraments was still the same. Of baptism they say: 'By the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited, and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such, whether of age or infants, as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time.' And of the eucharist to the same effect: 'Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacra-

ment, do also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporeally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death; the body and blood of Christ being then not corporeally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine, yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to the outward senses.

"These may be received as the views of the puritans themselves; including that extreme section who would have overthrown episcopacy and established in England a presbyterian or an independent church. For the church of Scotland naturally felt, and indeed formally expressed, a sympathy with the English puritans: and the Westminster divines, when the puritans properly so called had died out, succeeded in their place. Lord Bacon may be taken as a fair and, all must admit, a competent representative of the church party. Though averse to Whitgift's severity, and, in common with the other courtiers and statesmen of the day, not well pleased to be over-shadowed by the splendours of the hierarchy, still he was no puritan; he thought their scruples needless if not schismatical. He has left on record a confession of his faith which might, for the doctrines it contains, have been written indifferently by Cartwright or by Whitgift,—by an imprisoned puritan or by the head of the church of England. For its singular force and beauty, it well deserves a place in a religious history of those times. And it will confirm the position we have endeavoured to establish, that theological differences on points of doctrine had no share in the disputes which then rent the church of England.

"The authority of the christian ministry,—the source from whence it is derived, and the channel along which it flows,—has now for a long time been agitated with incessant heat amongst the various classes of religionists in England. It was not, however, one of those points upon which the puritans entertained any peculiar sentiments; or differed from their opponents of the other party. This root of bitterness had not yet sprung up: who were, and who were not, accredited ministers of Jesus Christ, was a point upon which a perfect agreement as yet existed between them. It was in the year 1589 that Bancroft, then chaplain to Whitgift, but afterwards bishop of London and archbishop of Canterbury, preached a sermon at St. Paul's cross which at once opened a new strife. He maintained in his sermon that bishops were, by the institution of God himself, an order in the christian ministry superior to priests and deacons, and distinct from them; and that they governed the church and the inferior clergy, *jure divino*, by a right inherent to their office, and derived from God alone. The denial of these truths, he said, was heresy."—pp. 224-228.

Vital as the doctrine of Episcopacy and Apostolical

succession has become in the theories of later Churchmen, Mr. Marsden holds that during this period of Anglicanism it was an open, or at least, an undecided question. Even the necessity of episcopal ordination itself, at that time, formed no essential dogma of Anglicanism. There are several remarkable examples of Presbyterian ministers not merely benefited, but holding high posts in the Church. The case of Whittington, Dean of Durham, is one of those cited by Mr. Marsden. He had been ordained at Geneva according to the Presbyterian form of that Church; and nevertheless, soon after the accession of Elizabeth, he was, without any further ceremonial, presented to the deanery of Durham, which he held unquestioned for fourteen years. Mr. Marsden is of opinion, too, that the real cause of his being disturbed in possession was not the defect of his ordination, but the obnoxious doctrines which he held and preached. When he was cited by the Archbishop of York, Sandys, the Genevan ordination was but one of the charges. Having declined the Archbishop's jurisdiction, a commission was appointed to hear the case, the president of which was Hutton, the Dean of York. And it is a significant specimen of the ideas on apostolical succession which then prevailed among English Churchmen, that Hutton openly declared his preference of "Genevan," over "Romish" ordination. "The Dean," said he, "was ordained in better sort than the Archbishop himself."

The case was carried to a new commission, of which "the lord president was a member. When the question of the ordination had been argued, the lord president exclaimed, 'I cannot agree to deprive him for that cause alone: this,' he said, 'would be ill taken by all the godly, both at home and abroad; that we allow of popish massing priests in our ministry, and disallow of ministers made in a reformed church.' The commission was again adjourned, and here the business dropped; for the next year the dean of Durham died."

Still more remarkable is the case of Travers, who was Hooker's colleague at the Temple.

"Whittingham had been ordained by the church of Geneva, a national institution, the church of a foreign state with which England was on terms of amity. It is uncertain whether Travers had not received deacon's orders according to the church of England (for he had a divinity degree from Cambridge); but he was a member, from the first, of the presbyterian church at Wandsworth.

Going abroad, he was certainly ordained a presbyter at Antwerp, by the synod there in 1578. Yet we find him associated with Hooker, as preacher at the Temple, in 1592. During this long interval, then, of fourteen years, his presbyterian orders had been allowed. He was also private tutor in the family of the lord treasurer Cecil. When at length silenced by Whitgift, it was objected to him, first, that he was not a lawfully ordained minister of the church of England; secondly, that he had preached without a licence; thirdly, that he had violated discipline and decency, by his public refutation of what Hooker, his superior in the church, had advanced from the same pulpit upon the same day. Had the first ground been felt by his opponents to have been impregnable, the other charges would probably have been omitted, and Travers would have been dismissed, no doubt, in a summary way. But it would seem that the stress was laid chiefly on the two latter articles; and indeed Travers was prepared with an answer to the first, and with an answer which he did not fail to use.

"An act had passed in the thirteenth year of queen Elizabeth, under which he was securely sheltered. It recognises the validity of foreign orders; and conveys to us historical evidence that ministers ordained by presbyterian synods were at that time beneficed in the church of England. The anomaly which admits a Romish priest but excludes a presbyter of the Scottish church, did not then exist. It was sufficient that the conforming minister should declare his assent, and subscribe to the articles of the church of England. Travers, in his petition to the privy council, pleads the force of this statute, and declares that many Scottish ministers were then holding benefices in England beneath its sanction. Attempts have been made to shew, that as the church of England recognised none but episcopal orders, the act of the thirteenth of Elizabeth cannot possibly refer to presbyterian ministers. But how far this assumption is correct, the passage we have cited from Hooker, and the case of dean Whittingham, to go no further, will at once enable the reader to decide.

"And though silenced at the Temple, Travers was still thought fit for high service in the church. Doctor Loftus, archbishop of Dublin and chancellor of Ireland, invited him to Dublin, and conferred upon him the office of provost of queen Elizabeth's new and royal foundation. This Travers accepted, and as head of Trinity college the world is indebted to him for the education of the illustrious Ussher, archbishop of Armagh. Civil war, the bane of Ireland, at length drove the provost from his post; the times were against him; he grew old and poor. Ussher still revered his teacher, visited him in person, and offered him presents of money; which, it is said, were thankfully declined."—pp. 233-5.

It does not appear, Mr. Marsden thinks, that in the first year of their existence as a party, the Puritans were

distinguished, at least to the extreme degree in which the peculiarity afterwards manifested itself, by any very marked rigorism of practice, or any notable preciseness and simplicity of manners. In this, however, we cannot agree. Even if there were no other evidence, the very name by which they were popularly designated, would sufficiently imply the existence of this peculiarity. The truth, however, is, that there needed in those times but scanty show of exterior sanctity in order to secure the reputation of affected purity of life. The Reformation had been followed in England by the same profaneness and laxity both of doctrines and of life, which we have often shown by the confession of its own leaders, to have been its ordinary accompaniment.* Mr. Marsden himself confesses, that towards the end of Elizabeth's reign, "the example of her court was decidedly irreligious, and the contagion rapidly spread among the common people. A preposterous extravagance in dress and equipage; a heathenish delight in jousts and tournaments, and public spectacles and plays; the prevalence of oaths (freely indulged in by the queen herself); and to crown the whole, the studied desecration of the Sabbath, mark too plainly the hollowness of that religious profession which even men of fashion were still constrained to make. All men of real piety lamented the decay of vital godliness. Hooker, in his preface, deploras it as feelingly as Travers could have done. But the cry once raised, a grave exterior and a virtuous life were regarded as the sure signs of a puritan, that is, of one disaffected to the state. Men who had never entered a conventicle, nor had one misgiving about the cross in baptism, were wickedly driven from the church they loved, by contemptuous treatment or slanderous imputations: to be seen twice at church on Sunday, and to spend the rest of the day in reading the scriptures, was enough to bring upon a whole family the disgrace of puritanism."

Their first decided conflict with this popular prejudice was in the sabbatarian controversy, the origin of which is well described by Mr. Marsden.

* See ante vol. vii. 290, and foll. also vol. xxv. 205, and following

"A great advantage was given to the puritans in a controversy which arose upon the observance of the Lord's-day. Greenham, a pious and eloquent minister in London, deeply affected by the prevailing levity, first recalled the nation to its duties, in 1592, in a book which made a great impression through the whole kingdom, and which Hall, the pious bishop of Norwich, afterwards embalmed in a striking epitaph. A few years afterwards, Dr. Bound published his 'book on the Sabbath;' in which, perhaps, he pushed the matter too far; and opposing one extreme fell into another; so as to rest the obligation of the Lord's-day upon Jewish, more than upon Christian, principles. Still he was right upon the whole; and, when the question was once fairly placed before them, the dullest congregation of the most stupid rustics could not but be struck with the monstrous and indecent inconsistency which every returning Sunday presented:—the fourth commandment was read in the forenoon with every circumstance calculated to inspire the deepest awe and reverence; the afternoon was devoted to fencing, and shooting, and bowling; to May games and morris dances; the clergyman himself too often a spectator, if not a sharer, of the sports. The parish church was frequently the scene of uproar. The painted harlequin rushed into it followed by a crowd of the dissolute and idle, and the instant the service closed one might hear the jingling of his bells, and see his company gathering around their leader in their 'fools coats' of many a colour. The evil was enormous; yet it was thought necessary to suppress Bound's treatise; and the natural consequence ensued; the book flew through successive editions, and its principles were diffused through England. The observance and the sacred obligation of the Lord's-day became immediately a question between the high church party and the puritans; and must be especially noticed as the first disagreement betwixt them upon any point of doctrine. This sabbatarian question, as it was called, henceforth entered largely into every controversy; a rigid or lax observance of the Lord's-day was at length the sign by which, above all others, the two parties were distinguished."—Pp. 245-7.

There is little of novelty, and indeed very little of depth in Mr. Marsden's history of the doctrinal conflicts between Puritanism and the antagonistic element of Anglicanism. His account of the Quinquarticular controversy, of the Hampton Court conference, and still more of the disputes arising out of the Synod of Dort, is exceedingly meagre and unsatisfactory; and the reader will learn more of the real history of this contest from a single chapter of Mr. Hardwicke's *History of the Articles*,* than from the

* Chapter vii. p. 155, and foll. See also Chapter ix.

weak and diluted dissertations of the historian of the Puritans.

There is one passage, however, which although not new, is worth transcribing for its own sake—the close of King James's Conference with the Puritan representatives at Hampton Court. It is thoroughly characteristic.

“Knewstubs was at length permitted to proceed. He craved permission to propose three queries. Had the church power to institute an external significant sign? Supposing the church had such power, was it lawful to add one sign where Christ had already ordained another? And, granting that these two questions could be answered in the affirmative, How far was such an ordinance of the church to bind dissatisfied consciences, without impeaching their christian liberty? To the first and second questions grave and reasonable answers were given by the prelates; to the last the king himself made answer. He told him that he would not argue that point with him, but answer him as kings are wont to speak in parliament, *le roy s'avisera*; adding withal that it smelled very rankly of anabaptism. A beardless boy in Scotland had told him, he said, not long ago, that he would submit to him in doctrine, but that matters of ceremony were to be left in christian liberty to every man, as they received more and more light from the illumination of the Spirit: ‘Even till they go mad,’ quoth the king, ‘with their own light. But I will none of that: I will have one doctrine and one discipline; one religion in substance and in ceremony: and therefore I charge you never more to speak on that point, how far you are bound to obey when the church hath ordained it.’ And so he asked them, continues the courtly historian of the Hampton court conference, if they had anything more to say!

“But his indignation burst all bounds when Dr. Reynolds dared to express the desire, always universal amongst the puritans, to have the prophecyings revised ‘as the reverend archbishop Grindal and other bishops desired of her late majesty;’ and that the clergy should be allowed to meet in provincial constitutions and in synods with the bishops. ‘At which speech,’ says Dr. Barlow, ‘his majesty was somewhat stirred, yet, which was admirable in him, without passion or show thereof, thinking that they aimed at a Scottish presbytery, which, says he, agreeth as well with a monarchy, as God and the devil. Then Jack and Tom, and Will and Dick shall meet, and at their pleasures censure me, and my council, and all our proceedings: then Will shall stand up and say, it must be thus; then Dick shall reply and say, nay marry, but we will have it thus: and here I must once reiterate my former speech, *le roy s'avisera*,’ &c.

"The indecency of this disgraceful scene was not yet at its height; the king concluded thus. Well, doctor, have you anything else to say?"

"*Dr. Reynolds.* No more, if it please your majesty.

"*The king.* If this be all your party hath to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse."—Pp. 270-2.

Mr. Marsden is, of course, indignant at the unkingly and unchristian menaces with which James broke up the conference. But he does not attempt to conceal the fact that the Puritans themselves, the celebrated Pilgrim Fathers, their independence once consolidated, exhibited the same intolerance of which they were the victims in England, and of which indeed their transatlantic colony was a living monument. It would carry us beyond the limit of our allotted space to enter into the particulars of this history, which indeed is already sufficiently familiar to most of our readers. But we shall allow Mr. Marsden himself to be the historian of the intolerance of the Pilgrim Fathers towards a sect who had at least this claim on their sympathy, that they had been victims of the same persecution which had driven themselves into a foreign exile. This extract is a very long one; but its interest as well as its importance will be a sufficient explanation. Mr. Marsden, after relating several instances of minor intolerance, and describing in detail the circumstances in which the profession of Quakerism was made a capital felony in the colony, dwells at more length on the case of Mary Dyer.

"Mary Dyer, a quaker, was expelled from Massachusetts. She found an asylum in Roger Williams' new colony of Rhode Island, where all sects were tolerated alike. But she believed that she was urged by the Spirit who cannot err to return to Boston. She 'felt a call.' Only the flippant and profane will scoff at the doctrine, or scorn the words in which it was expressed. It might, for aught we know, be well worthy of God himself, to employ this quaker exile to repeat a long-forgotten message of christian love at Boston, which was to rebuke the sour austerity of their religious pride, and to be re-echoed in after ages, to all the ends of the earth, teaching everywhere, as it passed along, the dignity of suffering for conscience and for God, and the infamy of the oppressor. Substantially, Mary Dyer was, with all her errors, a martyr for the gospel's sake; and her persecutors were, in that act at least, the enemies of God.

"Two friends accompanied her, William Robinson and Marma-

duke Stevenson. They had not been many days in Boston before they were seized, imprisoned, arraigned before the governor and magistrates, and in short, sentenced to the gallows. 'Give ear, ye magistrates,' exclaimed Stevenson, as the sentence was pronounced, 'and all ye who are guilty, for this the Lord hath said concerning you, and will perform his word upon you, that the same day ye put his servants to death, shall the day of your visitation pass over you, and ye shall be for ever cursed.' Mary Dyer folded her hands together, and meekly exclaimed, 'The will of the Lord be done.' The bravado of Stevenson the magistrates might disdain; but for the meekness of Mary Dyer they had no reply. Her calm submission enraged the governor. 'Take her away, marshal,' he exclaimed harshly. 'I return joyfully to my prison,' she said. 'You may leave me, marshal, I will return alone.' 'I believe you, Mrs. Dyer,' replied the marshal, 'but I must do as I am commanded.'

"The prisoners were brought out to the place of execution. Wilson attended the procession: a circumstance to be recorded as marking the hearty concurrence of the New England clergy in these dreadful scenes. Wilson gloried in his work. On the morning of the execution there had been some discussion with the magistrates as to the way in which the prisoners should be dealt with. 'Hang them,' exclaimed Wilson, 'or else'—and he drew his finger across his throat as if to intimate that assassination in prison might be less troublesome than a public execution. The victims ascended the scaffold, after affectionately embracing one another, and each in turn then bore an exulting testimony to the joy which had taken full possession of their souls. Robinson called upon the spectators to bear witness that 'he died for testifying to the light of Christ.' Stevenson's last words were, 'This day we shall be at rest with the Lord.' Mary Dyer walked between her two companions. 'Are you not ashamed to walk thus hand in hand with two young men?' said the marshal, with unfeeling insolence. 'No,' said she, 'this is to me the hour of the greatest joy I could have in this world. No eye can see, nor ear hear, nor tongue utter, nor heart understand, the sweet incomes and refreshings of the Spirit of the Lord, which I now feel.' The executioner proceeded and her companions died. She continued to stand unmoved, her clothes carefully adjusted, her eyes bandaged, the rope around her neck, and tied to the beam above her. At this instant a reprieve arrived, and she was taken down. She neither shrieked, nor swooned, nor wept. She stood still, and calmly told the agitated crowd, that unless the magistrates would annul their wicked law, she would rather die. She saw, no doubt, that otherwise the scaffold would one day claim her as its prey, and had no desire to return to a life of suffering, and face a second death upon the gallows. The bodies of Robinson and his fellow-martyr were cut down, stripped naked, and thrown into a hole beneath the gallows

by the hangman, with something more than his professional brutality. None of their friends were permitted to interfere.

"Mary Dyer was again banished to Rhode island, attended by a guard; and when the guard left her she returned again to Boston. Once more she was sentenced to be hanged. The trial was short, and not wanting in simplicity. Governor Endicot again presided. He asked her, in the first place,—willing, it is said, to afford an opportunity for evasion to the prisoner—whether she were the same Mary Dyer who had been previously before the court?

"'I am the same Mary Dyer.'

"'Then you own yourself a quaker?'

"'I own myself to be reproachfully called so.'

"'Then I must repeat the sentence once before pronounced upon you.' And he repeated the sentence.

"'That is no more than thou saidst before.'

"'But now it is to be executed; therefore prepare yourself for nine o'clock to-morrow.'

"Her husband—for though still young and beautiful, Mary Dyer was a wife and the mother of several children—interceded for her life. He had been separated from her while she was in Rhode Island, and was not privy to her return; indeed he was not a quaker. With the deep pathetic eloquence with which nature alone pleads, he wrote to her iron-hearted judges, and concluded thus—after first acknowledging 'her inconsiderate madness'—'I only say this: yourselves are, or have been, or may be, husbands and wives: so am I: yea, to one most dearly beloved. Oh! do not deprive me of her, but I pray give her to me once again. Pity me! I beg it with tears.' But his tears flowed in vain.

"The next day the scaffold was again erected upon Boston common, a mile away from her prison. She was strongly guarded, and before her and behind drums were continually beaten; for the eloquence of the dying is known to be imperishable. When she had ascended the scaffold, Wilson, the fanatic minister, was again at his post. 'O Mary Dyer,' he cried, 'repent, repent.' 'Nay, man,' she answered calmly, in words in which a puritan must have felt a keen rebuke, 'I am not *now* to repent.' She was again reproached with her pretended visions. She replied, and her peaceful demeanour seemed almost to explain her meaning, 'I have been in paradise many days.' The executioner performed his office; Mary Dyer was no more; and the crowd dispersed: but the brand of that day's infamy will never disappear from the annals of Massachusetts, nor from the story of the pilgrim fathers."—Pp. 320-324.

There is another case, that of William Leddra, related by Mr. Marsden, almost equally painful; but we must content ourselves with referring to the work itself for this and several similar instances. It is a subject in relation

to which all commentary would be unnecessary, were it not that in the denunciations of Catholic intolerance with which the public is so often entertained, all notice of these cruelties is not alone studiously avoided, but, by the care which is taken to represent intolerance as the peculiar vice of Popery, is at least inferentially denied.

The closing chapters of the *History of the Early Puritans* are devoted to the Laudian controversy; but this is a passage of English history so familiar to every student, and Mr. Marsden's narrative contains so little evidence of research, and so little originality of view, that we do not think it necessary to enter into it at length. We may say the same of the entire of his second volume, which contains the *History of the Later Puritans*, beginning with the commencement of the Civil War in 1642, and ending with the passing of the Act of Uniformity, and the ejection of the non-conforming clergy in 1662. The highest merit to which the writer can claim is that of having condensed into an orderly and tolerably agreeable narrative, the substance of the facts contained in the ordinary histories of the period.

We must repeat, in reference to the *History of the Later Puritans*, what we have already said of the earlier history: it has no pretension to the character of a theological history of their doctrine, or of the controversies in which they were engaged. On the all-important Laudian epoch it is miserably meagre. The chapter on the Westminster Assembly is somewhat more interesting; but it is deficient in precision and deals too much in generalities to satisfy a theological reader. Nor can we think that the work is likely to prove a useful or practical guide in those doctrinal enquiries which of late years in England have formed the great object, and have supplied the ordinary inspiration, of almost every historical investigator.

Every new controversy, indeed, that arises, serves but to show more clearly, that the only safe and satisfactory guide to the doctrinal character of the English Church is to be found in her own dogmatical and liturgical formularies. And it is therefore that we welcome with so much satisfaction every effort to facilitate this most important study, and to bring it within the reach, not only of the theological students, but of all readers possessed of ordinary intelligence. Mr. Hardwick's "*History of the Articles*," although we must dissent, of course, from most of its views

of Catholic controversy, is not only a great advance on the spirit of the older treatises, but is far more complete and satisfactory, as a scientific history of the doctrinal changes of which the various modifications of the articles were the exponents, and of the discussions and controversies which resulted in these successive modifications. The same may be said with even more truth of Mr. Procter's "*History of the Prayer Book.*" Although very decidedly anti-Roman in its tone, we gladly accept it as a substitute for the dull and dreary dogmatism of Wheatley. It presents in a popular and agreeable narrative, the history of those variations to which so much attention has been directed during the late eventful controversies; and while it contains a very careful, learned, and scholarlike exposition of these changes, it also furnishes a most valuable commentary on the successive texts of the formularies themselves, as they are exhibited either in the original editions, or in the useful manuals of Bulley and Keeling. Even confining ourselves to the subject of Puritan history, the appendix to the second chapter furnishes a most important supplement to the narrative of Mr. Marsden; while it also places in the clearest light the influence exercised on the Anglican Prayer-book by the foreign Reformers. A similar appendix to the third chapter fills up another very serious omission of Mr. Marsden, by a detailed review of the various Puritan editions of the Prayer-book, together with an exposition of the doctrinal discussions which led to these departures from the established form. But for the general controversies between Catholics and the Church of England, the value of the work will be felt still more sensibly. The chapters on the Burial-Service (p. 394), and on the Ordinal (p. 410), are amongst the best popular evidences with which we are acquainted of the 'variations of Anglicanism.'

Nor can we pass from this subject without alluding with warm approval to the excellent work of Father Waterworth, as the very best example we could offer of the importance of the history of the Anglican Formularies, and of the practical advantage which may be derived from it for the purposes of controversy. His chapter on the Articles, that upon the Liturgies, and that upon the Homilies, are full of most interesting and instructive information. They illustrate in detail every principle as to the twofold character of Anglicanism which we have endeavoured

voured to demonstrate, nor is it possible to read them, without a full conviction that every incident in the early history of Anglicanism—all her struggles with the Puritan element—all her concessions to its invading spirit—are but so many forms of that weak and vacillating tendency, by which she ever sought to comprehend as large a number of believers as possible within her ample formularies; which sacrificed theological exactness to human policy, and converted the stern precision of doctrinal truth into the loose and stammering vagueness of an insidious compromise.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

L.—*Growth in Holiness; or, the Progress of the Spiritual Life.*
By FREDERICK W. FABER, D. D. Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London, Dublin, and Derby, Richardson and Son, 1855.

It would be presumptuous in us, and a simple misleading of our readers, if we professed to give an analysis of this work in such a notice as the present, or even to say anything which could enhance the idea of its value. Fortunately such an attempt is unnecessary, for the name of Father Faber is a sufficient recommendation; his writings are amongst those most dearly and universally prized by Catholics. The many readers of the "All for Jesus" will be anxious for the continued and progressive teaching of its venerable Author. All Catholics will see the importance of this work, in which, as Father Faber himself says, "Every sentence, and frequently each clause of a sentence, is a judgment on matters about which all pious Catholics have a more or less formed opinion".....which is an attempt "to harmonize the ancient and modern spirituality of the Church, with something, perhaps, of a propension to the first, and to put it before English Catholics in an English shape, translated into native thought and feeling, as well as language."—pref.

- II.—*Abridgment of the History of England.* By JOHN LINGARD, D.D. With continuation from 1688 to the reign of Queen Victoria. Adapted for the use of schools. By JAMES BURKE, Esq., M.A., Barrister at Law. London: Dolman, 1855.

A judicious and agreeable abridgment was all that was wanting to complete the mission of the great Catholic historian of England. To riper students of every class, Dr. Lingard's larger history has long been available; and the many editions of various forms in which it has been reprinted, have made it universally accessible of late years. But the young have hitherto been almost entirely excluded from the fruits of his research and impartiality; and even in Catholic schools of high name, until very recently, the first lessons of English history were drawn from the old and contaminated sources. More than one abridgment, it is true, had appeared, but they were deficient in that clearness and simplicity, and especially in that lively and dramatic character which are essential in a narrative intended to interest the young imagination, and to stimulate the unpractised memory.

Mr. Burke's abridgment, in these particulars, is completely successful. He has adopted the wise expedient of retaining as far as possible the language of the admirable author whom he undertakes to abridge; and while he, of course, condenses the facts into a uniform and unbroken history, he has preserved many descriptive scenes, sketches of character, and remarkable narratives, in the very words of the original history. The result is a degree of elegance and of animation, quite unusual in such a compendium, and which, in truth, is almost unattainable without some such expedient, unless where, as in the case of Sismondi, the compendium is drawn up by the writer's own hand.

The continuation is, of course, extremely brief, but it appears careful and judicious, and we do not hesitate to pronounce the work, as a whole, one of the most valuable additions to our scanty school literature which we have met with for many years.

- III.—*The Seven Words spoken by Our Lord on the Cross.* From the German of the Rev. Dr. Veitch. London: T. Jones, 1855.

This little book contains impressive reflections on the consummation of the Redemption, which will be welcome to our Catholic readers.

IV.—*Logic; or the Science of Inference.* By JOSEPH DEVEY. (Bohn's Library.) London: Henry G. Bohn. 1854.

We had occasion in a recent article, on the study of Logic in England, to animadvert upon the anti-religious tendency, half avowed, half unconscious, but nevertheless, quite unmistakeable, by which many late contributions of English scholars to this science are distinguished. It is pleasant to be able to welcome in the excellent popular treatise now before us a marked exception to this prevailing characteristic. We are glad to recognize in Mr. Devey's work not only a disposition (in common with all the really profound writers upon this subject), to acknowledge the merits of the old scholastic writers, whom it once was the fashion indiscriminately to decry, but a seeming general sympathy with catholic principles and catholic views. It is not merely that he has done justice to the merits of some of our modern catholic logicians, Ubaghs, Galluppi, Genovesi, etc.; that he has taken occasion, in more than one place, to draw illustrations from catholic doctrines, and to expose the unsoundness and fallacy of more than one anti-catholic prejudice. And we rejoice still more to observe that the bent of his mind in discussing many of the leading controversies among logicians, is commonly towards that view of the question which is most in accordance with catholic principles and catholic notions. We allude particularly to his remarks on "Analysis and Synthesis," on "Nominalism and Realism," on "Authority as a source of Evidence," and (more obscurely but yet observably) on "Criteria of Evidence."

The same spirit is still more noticeable in the "Book on Fallacies," which contrasts very favourably in this particular with Archbishop Whateley's book on the same subject, referred to in a former article.

As a Treatise of Logic, for popular use, therefore, we do not hesitate to recommend it in preference to any other in the English language. The rules and explanations are simple and intelligible, and, nevertheless, are sufficiently technical; combining accuracy with as much of ease of style as can be attained in a purely scientific treatise. We particularly recommend the chapter on syllogisms, in which the new canon of "mediate inference" is extremely well explained, and applied (as alone it can practically be

applied) through the old General Rules of the school logicians.

One of the great merits of Mr. Devey's treatise, indeed, consists in his availing himself of all the real improvements of modern writers, but, as far as possible, engrafting them upon the old and received systems. But he is no blind follower even of the most distinguished modern names; and, while he admits its value in some particulars, he rejects without ceremony for popular use, Mr. Baynes's "New Analytic," ushered in as it is with all the prestige of the authority of the deservedly celebrated Sir W. Hamilton.

We cannot conclude without alluding to the *Historical Introduction* prefixed to the volume. We have seldom seen a greater amount of useful information more agreeably condensed into a few pages.

V.—*An Abridged History of England*, for Catholic Seminaries and Young Persons. By W. F. Mylius. Seventh Edition. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

We are glad to see the Seventh Edition of this deservedly popular school-book. Its merits are too well known to need a lengthened notice.

VI.—*A History of India under the two first Sovereigns of the House of Taimur, Baber and Humayun*. By WILLIAM ERSKINE, ESQ., translator of the Memoirs of the Emperor Baber. 2 vols., 8vo. London: Longmans, 1854.

Those of our readers who give any attention to Oriental literature may recollect the exceedingly curious and interesting autobiography of the Tatar conqueror of India, Baber, a translation of which was published many years since by the Oriental Translation Society, and attracted much attention from all literary men of the time. The subject of that autobiography is the older of the two sovereigns, whose reigns form the subject of Mr. Erskine's volumes.

We need scarcely explain that the territory at present subject to British rule in India was invaded and over-run in the sixteenth century by a Tatar army, under Mohammed Baber Padishah, a descendant of the great Timour, and the founder of the Timour dynasty in India, which preceded the period of British occupation. The expedi-

tion was first undertaken in 1524, and terminated two years later in the complete triumph of the Tatar arms at the famous field of Paniput, memorable for more than one decisive event of Indian history. Baber did not live many years to enjoy his conquest, having died in 1530. He was succeeded by his son, Mahommed Humayun, and the Timour dynasty was continued through four successive sovereigns after him, until the establishment of British ascendancy in the Indian peninsula.

The work now before us contains the history of two of those reigns. The author, Mr. Erskine—the translator, conjointly with Mr. Leyden, of Baber's *Autobiography*—had originally projected a complete history of the Timour dynasty in India. The project, however, was interrupted by his death, and the reigns of Baber and Humayun alone were completed.

Independently of the great political importance of the history, we know few lives more interesting, in a purely literary point of view, than that of the great Emperor Baber. The narrative of his early life is full of all the excitement of a romance, and the history of his wars and his administration, are not inferior in interest and instruction to those of the most distinguished conquerors, whether of ancient or of modern times. It was no exaggerated panegyric on the part of the translator of his *autobiography* to describe him as "one of the most illustrious men of his age, and one of the most eminent and accomplished princes who ever adorned a throne." Brave, chivalrous, and humane, his wars form an exception to the general characteristics of savage warfare. His legislation was far beyond its age. His private character, though not exempt from the stains which are almost inherent in the position which he occupied, was not disgraced by any of the enormities which would seem all but inseparable from the possession of absolute power in the East. A lover of letters himself, he was a generous patron of literature in his court; and there are few sovereigns among the many who have aspired to literary reputation,—who have established higher claims than those of Baber, as they rest upon his poetry and the *autobiography* already described.

The life of Humayun, with less of personal interest, has, perhaps, more of political importance.

The work of Mr. Erskine is executed with much care and research, and though it makes no pretension to bril-

liancy or elegance, is marked by much simplicity, and an excellent and judicious order.

VII.—*The Juvenile Annual; or, Short Stories for Little Children.* Dublin, J. Duffy, 1853.

It is a difficult thing to write pure and appropriate Children's books, and, albeit, frequently an unappreciated service even when well done. To perform such a task it is necessary for the writer to become a child again—a virtuous, intelligent, and experienced child—acquainted with good and evil, and able to present them, as in a mirror, for the contemplation and guidance of the young. The present volume is from the German of Canon Von Schmid, and comprises one hundred short tales, or scenes of life, all keeping forcibly in view the “Great First Cause.” The sections, or tales, are all short and adapted to the capacities of very young children, and must have a beneficial influence on the minds of its little readers, but those of maturer years will find much pleasure and profit in perusing the home truths of this volume.

- VIII.—1. *Progressive Exercises in Latin Elegiac Verse, First Series*, with References to the Rules of Latin Grammar and Parallel Passages of the Latin Poets, by Edward Walford, M. A., late Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford, (sixth edition,) London, Longmans and Co.
- 2.—*Progressive Exercises in Latin Elegiac Verse, Second Series*, with Reference to the Latin Poets, and to a new “Grammar of Latin Poetry” prefixed to the work, by E. WALFORD, M. A. London, Longmans and Co.
- 3.—*Hints on Latin Writing*, (third edition,) by E. WALFORD, M. A. London, Longmans and Co.
- 4.—*Progressive Exercises in Latin Prose Composition*, with a Table of Latin and English Idioms, and References to the Author's “Hints on Latin Writing,” by E. WALFORD, M. A. London, Longmans and Co.
- 5.—*A Card of the Greek Accents*, (third edition,) by E. WALFORD, M. A. London, Longmans and Co.

The above-mentioned series of Educational works by Mr. Walford is constructed upon the plan of imitation and frequent repetition adopted with such success by the late Rev. T. K. Arnold; the works are considerably simpler than those of Mr. Arnold, and we may add, far cheaper also. Their merits are now very generally recognized in

the English public schools and universities, and we are glad to hear that they are in colleges. We observe that Mr. Walford is also about to publish a "Handbook to the Greek Drama," as well as a series of "Exercises in Hexameter and Lyric Verse," and a series of examination papers, under the title of "*Palæstræ Musarum*."

IX.—*Leaves from a Family Journal*. From the French of Emile Souvestre. London: Groombridge and Sons, 1855.

A very pleasing translation of one of M. Souvestre's interesting tales.

X.—*A Novena in Honour of the Glorious Mother, St. Teresa of Jesus, with Meditations for Each Day*. Translated from the French, with Litany of the Holy Heart of Joseph. Richardson and Son, London, Dublin, and Derby, 1852.

This excellent little book of devotions, addressed to one of the greatest saints whose names occur in the Church's Calendar, will be welcomed by many a daughter of St. Teresa. It comprises all the necessary instructions for gaining those indulgences which were granted by the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, and the Bishop of Valladolid, to the faithful of their dioceses, who would perform a novena in honour of the Saint. It comprises a suitable meditation and prayer for each day during the novena, together with the Litanies of St. Teresa and St. Joseph. We feel sure that we need say no more in order to recommend it to the faithful. Might we suggest that some few trifling grammatical faults in the former Litany, on pp. 63-4, may be rectified with advantage in a future edition, and that for "who *were*," &c., the more correct "who *wert*," may be substituted? Surely, too, instead of "You whose soul," &c., the translator might have adopted the simple form, "*Thou* whose soul was disengaged," &c.

XI.—*The Apocalypse Fulfilled; or, An Answer to "Apocalyptic Sketches, by Dr. Cumming."* By the Rev. P. S. DESPREZ, B.D. London: Longmans, 1854.

The mystery of the Apocalypse seems destined to afford an inexhaustible theme to the commentator. A very curious volume might be made out of the various speculations, which, at different times, have been offered towards

its solution, from the ravings of the wild enthusiasts of the fourteenth century, who built their system upon its basis, to the learned exposition referred to by Mr. Desprez, which gravely explains the Apocalypse as distinctly "foretelling a certain hail-storm, which injured parts of France, in July 13, 1788," and asserts that "a little frog, called the Tractarian heresy, had been heard by St. John to croak all the way from St. Barnabas to Patmos, at the distance of two thousand years!"

Mr. Desprez' volume is a pleasing contrast, both in tone and execution, to the fanatical "Apocalyptic Sketches," against which it is directed. Its purpose is to show that "the key to the Apocalypse is the closing of the Jewish dispensation, the gathering in of the elect, and the coming of the Son of Man." Mr. Desprez discards as "folly, nay, more, impiety," the idea of looking in the Apocalypse for an "exposition of the distant future." His own interpretation is sober, learned, and moderate, and although we are far, of course, from subscribing to its theology as a whole, yet there is much in it with which we heartily sympathize. We gratefully recognize especially the boldness with which he scouts the arbitrary and fanatical anti-Roman expositions of Dr. Cumming, and the writers of his school; and we cordially recommend the Fourteenth Lecture as a most happy and successful demolition of the common basis on which all these expositions are made to rest.

Mr. Desprez makes it plain to every dispassionate student that this basis is not only arbitrarily assumed, but both historically and hermeneutically untenable.

XII.—*Truth's Conflicts and Truth's Triumphs; or, the Seven Headed Serpent Slain.* A Series of Essays, with an Allegorical Refutation of some chief Errors of the Day. By STEPHEN JENNER, M.A. 8vo. London: Longmans, 1854.

As Mr. Jenner is a gentleman of allegorical tastes, it is only fair to allow him to state his case in his own fashion.

It appears from Mr. Jenner's Introduction, (pp. 1—22,) that, by some unlucky chance, a serpent made its way into a certain house, and "coiled itself up under a couch, where a man lay down and slept for a length of time, unaware of his danger." Now such was "the effect of the vital warmth" of this singular visitant "upon the

sleeper's brain," that he dreamed "a strange, at first pleasant, at length troubled, dream," the most remarkable incident of which was, that he fancied himself in a gorgeous Puseyite church, where he heard a long ultra-Tractarian sermon! We could hardly wonder, as we read this composition, that acting in conjunction with "the soporific influence" and "peculiar narcotic power" of the serpent, this prosy composition had the effect of holding him fast bound "in the chains of insensibility" until "a heaven-sent messenger touched him on his side, and said, 'Awake, arise, behold the light of day!'" A terrible conflict ensued, in which, with the aid of a "double-edged sword," which he luckily found upon the table, "he succeeded in hacking off the seven heads of this terrible beast;" after which, very naturally, he fell once more into a peaceful and refreshing sleep, in the course of which he was visited by another dream, (pp. 301-30,) which led him into another church, (this time a church of the pure evangelical type,) and introduced him to a second discourse, now, of course, framed on the most approved Low-church principles, and scattering to the winds all the fallacies of its Tractarian predecessor!

In case any of our friends should be unfortunate enough to find this terrible serpent coiled up some winter night under their couch, it is a friendly act to apprise them that the seven "Essays," which Mr. Jenner introduces by means of this ingenious allegory, are "the double-edged sword," described above, and that the maker warrants it to cut off the seven heads of the pestilential beast with unerring certainty, and with the least possible personal trouble on the part of the operator!

XIII.—*Hardwicke's Shilling Peerage*, for 1855, (to be continued annually.) Compiled by EDWARD WALFORD, Esq. M. A., Balliol College, Oxford. London: R. Hardwicke.

We are glad, for the sake of the public convenience, to see this neat and most accurately compiled little pocket volume; but seeing the name of its compiler, we are still more glad, as we are sure *all* our readers will be, to hear that it has obtained an early and rapid sale. Very many who do not care much for a pocket peerage for its own sake, will take an interest in a little work which promises, we trust, to be a permanent source of emolument to a

gentleman who has sacrificed so much, and is so highly respected as Mr. Walford. It will be followed by similar volumes as to the Baronetage and the House of Commons.

XIV.—*Ince's Outlines of English History*, for the use of Schools. London: J. Gilbert, 49, Paternoster-row.

History in general, and English history in particular, has often been called a lie and conspiracy against Catholic truth. We must, however, make an exception from this sweeping censure in favour of the above little work on English History, which must have a surprising sale among the Protestant schools of England, if we may judge from the fact that it has attained to its eighty-third thousand. It is fair and impartial, and strikes us as the best book of its kind for young persons, as it is free from all those anti-Catholic remarks which disfigure the pages of all our most popular manuals.

XV.—*Father Rowland; or, the Force of Truth*. London, Dublin and Derby, Richardson and Son.

This little story has long been a popular Catholic tale in North America, and the present edition, we welcome very cordially in England. Our esteemed contemporary, the *Rambler*, has been suggesting the formation of Catholic Lending Libraries, attached to the various missions in England and Wales; and we think that, whenever it publishes a further list of useful books for plain and simple people, which might be added to such libraries with advantage, the Editor will not fail to find a place for "Father Rowland." The little work is edited, and has been enlarged by a Catholic bishop, and is published at a low price such as will secure for it a wide circulation. The story is one especially adapted to come home to the hearts of such persons as have been brought up in ignorance of the bigotry against the Catholic Faith.

XVI.—*The Last Earl of Desmond; a Historical Romance of 1599-1603*. 2 vols., 8vo. Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1854.

Since the first movement for the revival, or rather the creation, of Irish national literature, which began some years ago, we have imagined to ourselves, as one of

the most powerful auxiliaries in popularizing the undertaking, a series of historical novels on subjects selected from Irish history. We have looked indulgently, therefore, on every effort in that direction, and have thought tenderly of all short-comings in the performance, in consideration of the end towards which it was directed.

There are limits, however, even to the largest toleration; and we are forced to say that "*The Last Earl of Desmond*" lies far beyond its boundary line. It is ill-conceived, ill-planned, and ill-written. With the single exception of the Earl himself, there is not one Irish character of which, as Irishmen, we are not ashamed. It presents cunning, coarseness, vulgarity, selfishness, treachery, and falsehood, as the moral characteristics of the Irish of the period; and its only representative of their religion is a clumsy reproduction of the old stereotyped bugbear of the No-papery novelist—a false, crafty, and thoroughly unprincipled Jesuit.

We think it necessary to notice these things as a caution to those who might possibly (like ourselves) be misled by the title. As for the book itself, its caricature of the Irish people is beneath refutation, and its calumnies upon their religion are below contempt.

XVII.—*Legends of Mount Leinster*. By HARRY WHITNEY PHILOMUTH. Dublin, Kennedy, 1855.

There is a vigour and originality about many of these sketches which would sufficiently recommend the book, even if it had no higher object than to supply the amusement of a leisure hour. But there is a great part of its contents that well deserves to be perused for its own sake. "*Clonmullin and its Traditions*," and "*a Sunday with Father Murphy*," are both excellent after their kind. The writer is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of his theme, and we do not doubt that we shall meet him again before long in the same field of Irish literature.

XVIII.—*A Third Gallery of Portraits*. By GEORGE GILFILLAN. Edinburgh: Hogg, 1854.

Mr. Gilfillan's Portraits are too well known to need any description at our hands. The present series contains sketches of the French Revolutionists, of several eminent

English Preachers, of the most notable members of the new school of Poetry, Smith, Massey, and "Sidney Yendys," together with a miscellaneous collection of the critics, politicians, novelists, and historians of our own time. Each of these sketches might itself furnish matter for a separate criticism, but having already spoken sufficiently of Mr. Gilfillan's general manner, it will be enough for us to say, that his third series of portraits resembles in many particulars of style and tone the former volumes of the series. The sketches of the French Revolutionists are the best and most interesting in the volume.

XIX.—*The Poetry of Christian Art.* Translated from the French of A. F. Rio. London, Bosworth, 1854.

The name of Rio is well known to all lovers of Christian Art; and they will rejoice to see his charming sketch of its rise and development translated into English so well and smoothly, that we perceive no drawback upon the pleasure of reading it.

XX.—*Mahometanism in its Relation to Prophecy; or an Inquiry into the Prophecies concerning Antichrist, with some Reference to their Bearing on the events of the present day.* By AMBROSE LISLE PHILLIPS, Esq. London: Dolman. 1855.

We are exceedingly inclined to involve all lay interpreters of prophecy in the sweeping sentence, "that where they are not superfluous they are mischievous." It may be answered perhaps, that by this indiscriminating censure, we do but acknowledge our own incompetence to come to any decision concerning the secrets of futurity. Such—with all humility—we admit to be the fact; and we must, in consequence, decline following Mr. Phillips through his various speculations; we will only say that he has exercised much thought and ingenuity upon a subject which so generally excites interest and curiosity that we have no doubt of his finding many readers.

XXI.—*Ethel; or, the Double Error.* By MARIAN JAMES. London: Groombridge and Son, 1854.

There is considerable talent in this novel, but it is not a pleasing one. A small group of figures, strongly and harshly characterized, is thrown into, or rather they place

themselves in situations so painful and so faulty, that they lose that spell upon the feelings which should belong to the personages of fiction, whether good or bad. The story, though slight, is well constructed, and the conception of the three principal characters shows great knowledge of human nature. The passionate love which passes by rapid, yet perfectly natural transition, into the passion for distinction, in the stern powerful young man who enacts the hero;—the rash self-sacrifice, unprincipled and fruitless, of the heroine;—the passion of the half-selfish voluptuary, selfish even while centering his happiness in another, who will at all risks grasp the desire of his heart, and does so in the possession of an unloving bride, who becomes almost immediately a disappointment and a bane to him;—in all this there is much that is forcibly told; and—which is not always the case—the story bears strongly and directly upon the moral it professes to illustrate. Fiction, however, requires lighter graces; and as it is not its primary object to teach, so the instruction which it does convey should be kept in the background. If it be allowable for a novel to create in the mind a tragic interest, it certainly ought not to leave a dreary impression, which we confess to have been in ourselves the result of reading “Ethel, or the Double Error;” ill-omened title! *one* of any magnitude may impart sufficient gloom to any history, whether of truth or fiction.

XXII.—*A Popular Sketch of the Origin and Development of the English Constitution from the Earliest Period to the Present Time.* By HENRY RAIKES, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Dalton, 1851-4.

A popular work on the history of the Constitution is unquestionably a want in our literature. Blackstone's preliminary Dissertation is now antiquated. De Lolme is superficial and inexact. Hallam's Constitutional History, with all its undoubted merit, is better suited for the scholar and antiquarian than for the ordinary reader; and on the other hand, the brilliant and striking sketch which forms the introduction to Mr. Macaulay's History of England, though luminous and comprehensive in no ordinary degree, is too rapid, and descends too little into details, to satisfy the requirements of the careful enquirer.

Mr. Raikes's publication had its origin in his being requested, several years since, to deliver a course of

lectures for a Mechanics' Institute at Chester, and the materials collected for these lectures have formed the nucleus of his present essay. It is, therefore, as may be supposed, extremely popular in its plan; but it also bears the marks of extensive and accurate reading.

The first volume comprises the long period from the Anglo-Saxon times to the Reformation. In the second the history is carried down through the Civil War, the Restoration, and the Revolution, to the more peaceful political and social changes of our own day. With but little pretension to originality in his views of the great events of the history of England, and of their influence in originating or modifying the details of the constitutional system, Mr. Raikes's narration is exceedingly terse, orderly, and often striking; his opinions are in the main solid and judicious; and they are always put forward with clearness, simplicity, and moderation. The fourth chapter of the first volume on "The Origin of Parliament," and the fourth and fifth chapters of the second volume, which chiefly regard the modification of the representative principle brought about by the Revolution, are especially worthy of commendation; and the concluding chapter on Jurisprudence will be found a very useful popular summary of the great constitutional principles of the civil and criminal law of England.

In his views of English Ecclesiastical history, Mr. Raikes is an earnest evangelical; and in his sketch of the Reformation, and of the post-Reformation struggle, not only during the reigns of Elizabeth and James, and still more through the Laudian era, he leans strongly to the Low-church principles; but although our sympathies, as Catholics, are with many of the views of Anglican controversy to which he is most decidedly opposed, we willingly recognize in his dealing with the subject of our own Church, a disposition to candour and good faith. His views of the several influences of the action of the Mediæval Church are substantially those of M. Guizot; and in his account of the Reformation in England, though it is strongly Protestant, there is no attempt to disguise the unjust and oppressive measures by which it was accompanied. There is, however, as might be expected in all his inferences and doctrines, a tone of assumption throughout, which, however unconscious on his part, cannot fail to be offensive to a catholic reader.

There is one statement, too, in his sketch of the Elizabethan laws, which we cannot pass without notice. He alleges (i. 301.) that, "all the Romanists who fell in her persecutions, *suffered as traitors not as heretics.*" It would carry us far beyond our prescribed limit to enter into the detailed refutation of this most inconceivable misstatement. We need only refer to any one of our catholic historians, to Lingard, Challoner, Dodd, or Milner, for abundant evidence of its untruth; and it is the more unjustifiable, inasmuch as in his account of the analogous proceedings of Mary in relation to the Protestant zealots of her reign, he represents them, notwithstanding the humorous exposure of the seditious, disloyal and anti-social principles which Mr. Maitland has made, as resting on purely religious grounds.

XXIII.—*What every Christian must know—How to get ready and go to Confession—Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity—Rule of Life, Good Works, Sins, Conscience.* Permissu Superiorum. London, Dublin, and Derby, Richardson and Son, 1854.

Of the many cheap and useful publications which have been issued from the Catholic Press of Derby, from the appearance of the celebrated "Derby Reprints" to the present time, we are inclined to think that none have been more useful, or have produced greater fruit, amongst our own people at least, (for we do not now allude to books of controversy) than such little works as the above, published as they are at an extremely low price. The Catholic body, as such, is notoriously a poor one, and no class has a stronger claim upon us than the very poorest amongst ourselves. We do not, of course, admit the wholesale charges of ignorance brought against us by our adversaries, though the circumstances of many of our people are such that they require every facility that we can possibly afford them for the exercise of their religious duties. The publication at the head of this notice will be found extremely useful to the clergy in many localities. Besides the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, &c., a most excellent and simple Rule of Life is added; and each day of the week is assigned to some particular devotion appropriate to the day. The book is intended for distribution by the Redemptorist Fathers, during their missions. We will only add that such publications are worthy of the sons of S. Alphonsus, and we sincerely hope that it will produce all the good it is so well calculated to effect.

XXIV.—*Tracts on Catholic Unity.* London: Darling, 1851-2.

These tracts, five of which have hitherto appeared at intervals, are written by "Members of the Church of England." The first is entitled "The Providential Direction of the Movement of 1833 towards visible Catholic Unity." The second is a reprint of an "Essay" (published in the last century) "to procure Catholic Communion on Catholic Principles." The third and fourth respectively are, "The one Sacrifice on Many Altars," and "The one Real Presence the Centre of Adoration," while the fifth is a reprint of a sermon by Dr. Pusey, called "Christ in us and we in Him, the Bond of Catholic Unity." We do not desire in any way to check the yearnings after unity felt by those amiable and excellent individuals, who profess to be in earnest in what every Catholic must admit to be a good work; but we feel that after all, if God has given to His Church a centre of unity, and invested that centre with His own infallible guidance, there is but one road to Catholic unity open, and that is by submission to the See of Rome.

XXV.—*Edmund Burke, being First Principles selected from his Writings.* With an Introductory Essay by ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M. A. London, Routledge and Co., 1853.

There are persons who dislike selections from a favourite author; but we consider them very useful. The world, like an individual, increases in wisdom, or at least in knowledge. Many truths which it required intuitive genius to penetrate, and manly courage to defend, are now become a common property, so hackneyed that no genius can give them freshness or flavour. They have done their work, and fall into the lumber-room of learning, and often drag after them the name of him who first held them forth, as torches for the guidance of mankind. That author is happy who finds a genuine admirer to cull from his pages before they are forgotten, the choicest specimens,—such germs as may deserve to be handed down from age to age, so lustrous that they sparkle in any setting which the spirit of the age may give them.

Such a friend has Mr. Montgomery been to Burke; and we are sure that to many of our readers, this judi-

cious selection of Burke's wise, sagacious thoughts, which he enforced with exquisite eloquence, will afford a new and great pleasure. Deep-sighted, experienced, temperate amidst all his fire and greatness of soul, Burke deserves to be still considered as a leader; without vouching for the truth, in a Christian point of view, of all his conclusions,—we may safely say that few men have written so little that can be blamed. We will not give extracts from a volume, the whole of which we warmly recommend: one passage only we must extract, not that it is more beautiful than many others, but on account of its peculiar application to the circumstances of the present time.—p. 255.

"Never was there a jar or discord between genuine sentiment and sound policy. Never, no, never, did nature say one thing and wisdom say another. Nor are sentiments of elevation in themselves turgid and unnatural. Nature is never more truly herself than in her grandest form. The Apollo of Belvedere (if the universal robber has yet left him at Belvedere,) is as much in nature as any figure from the pencil of Rembrandt, or any clown in the rustic revels of Teniers. Indeed, it is when a great nation is in great difficulties that minds must exalt themselves to the occasion, or all is lost. Strong passion, under the direction of a feeble reason, feeds a low fever, which serves only to destroy the body that entertains it. But vehement passion does not always indicate an infirm judgment. It often accompanies, and actuates, and is even auxiliary to a powerful understanding; and when they both conspire and act harmoniously, their force is great to destroy disorder within, and to repel injury from abroad. If ever there was a time that calls on us for no vulgar conception of things, and for exertions in no vulgar strain, it is the awful hour that Providence has now appointed to this nation. Every little measure is a great error; and every great error will bring on no small ruin. Nothing can be directed above the mark that we must aim at; everything below it is absolutely thrown away."

XXVI.—*The Thistle and the Cedar of Lebanon.* By Habeeb Risk Allah Effendi, &c., &c. London, Madden, 1854.

This is a taking title, and is, together with a showy binding, and the portrait of a very handsome gentleman in the title page, the chief recommendation of the volume. Perhaps we should except the glowing eulogiums upon some five hundred matchless and exalted individuals, who have honoured the author with their especial favour, and whose gratitude, we presume, has carried the book into a

second edition. For, in sober earnest, it has no merit ; a book of travels it cannot be considered, as the author makes a point of passing over every place which has been described by previous travellers. It may be called a sketch of the author's life and opinions, with which are mingled some few interesting traits of Syrian customs ; but the former of these subjects has not (in our opinion) sufficient importance to engross much attention, and the latter lack the piquancy of a good style to set them off. With a large party there would be a recommendation, doubtless, in the extreme anti-Catholic feeling which pervades the work ; but even this is enforced in a clumsy manner, which cannot be very gratifying. As, for instance, the author describes with bitter ill-humour, and under the express designation of the "insidious arts of Rome," the unremitting, generous charities of the numerous Catholic convents in Syria and Palestine, and the excellence of the Catholic schools, and proceeds in the same page to admit, that, "alas ! not even in Beyrout can the English boast of ever so mean an establishment for the exercise of charity : " (p. 376,) upon which subject, and upon the necessity of sending out medical missionaries, (this would be by no means considered as an "insidious art,") he lectures his friends for at least the space of seven pages. Will it be believed that after this, Allah Effendi laboriously explains the title of his work by pointing out the English Church as "the Cedar of Lebanon," and the Catholics as "the wild beast" of the present day in Lebanon, which is "passing by and treading down the humble and unsupported Thistle," (p. 374,) id est, the Greek Church? We make our Protestant friends a present of the author's advocacy, his similes, and in general of his book.

XXVII.—*Political Sketches ; Twelve Chapters on the Struggles of the Age.* By CARL RETSLAG, Dr. PHIL., of Berlin, late Professor in the University of Rostock. London : Theobald, 1854.

These lectures are exceedingly well worth reading ; faulty they are no doubt, for with all his acuteness Dr. Retslag has missed the clue in the difficulties of his subject. What theories can a man form as to past history,—what conjectures as to the future fate of empires, to whom the Catholic Church is simply an inconvenience,—an

eccentric exception to all the rules of common sense,—a hindrance upon the march of events—a thing to be got rid of? As it not only cannot be got rid of, but cannot be kept in the back-ground in the discussion of any single question, it is evident into what shifts and falsehoods the clearest headed man must be driven to escape this monster difficulty; and our author has his full share of these. Except, however, where it is turned aside by this subject, the judgment of Dr. Retslag is sound, and his observations valuable. As a foreigner he has means of judging of those under-currents of feeling which the foreign press does not fully express. The necessity of curbing the power of Russia, and the paramount importance of Germany upon European politics, are points upon which mankind are now well agreed; but the complication of interest and feeling, arising between the different German nationalities,—the mutual distrust which exists between the people and their rulers, and the way in which Russian influence pervades and affects the whole of Germany, are points upon which a German can give much useful information.

XXVIII.—*Ione's Dream, and other Poems.* By JANE EMILY HERBERT. London: Pickering, 1853.

We cannot bestow much praise on these poems. The paucity of thought in them is remarkable; a very few pages might contain every idea in the book, and these are lost in a glitter of words, a maze of epithets; they are, moreover, so involved in lengthy phrases and false versification, as quite to defy an investigation, which, indeed, they would ill repay.

XXIX.—*Gahan's History of the Bible*, interspersed with Moral Reflections and Instructive Lessons. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

This is a new edition of the well known work, *Reeves' History of the Bible*, and has been published in a cheap form for the purpose of more general use in our Catholic schools. The late Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop and Bishop of the province of Westminster, as our Catholic readers doubtless remember, dwells very earnestly on the great and pressing need of erecting Catholic schools in every mission, and of providing for the children a better

education both religious and secular. And, indeed, if it were for no higher reason, we might plead for the introduction of a good class book on Scripture History on one ground; namely, that as Catholics, we cannot consent to the desecration of the Holy Bible, by placing it as a common text-book and lesson-book, to be irreverently thumbed and tossed about in a village school. But the book is further necessary, in order to imbue our Catholic children, and especially those of poor parents, with right and proper ideas on the subject of the Old Testament, and the true relation of the children of Israel, their typical rites, customs, and shadowy sacrifices, with the good tidings and realities which stand as their antitypes in the New Testament. We can confidently recommend this little book as likely to contribute to so good an end.

XXX.—*The Use of Books.* In Two Lectures to the Cork Young Men's Society. By JOHN GEORGE MACCARTHY, President. Cork: O'Brien, 1855.

We have not for a long time read a lecture, on a purely literary topic, with more pleasure than we have derived from the perusal of these brilliant and effective addresses. There is a grace and vigour in the style, a manly originality in the sentiments, and a healthy and natural simplicity in the tone,—qualities, the importance of which we gladly recognize in a lecturer, who, from his position as president of a Society, and from the influence which it seems likely to secure for him, may be looked to as a model by the young men with whom he is associated.

We had marked more than one passage for extract, both as specimens of the author's style, and for the sake of the solid and useful views which they put forward. But the necessities of space compel us to be content with a general but most cordial commendation of the manner in which this very important and practical subject is discussed.